DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 433 620 EA 030 038

AUTHOR Murphy, Joseph
TITLE The Quest for a Center: Notes on the State of the Profession of Educational Leadership.
PUB DATE 1999-04-00
NOTE 106p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Montreal, Quebec, Canada, April 19-23, 1999).
PUB TYPE Opinion Papers (120) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Administration; Educational History; Elementary Secondary Education; *Instructional Leadership; Professional Associations; Professional Development; *School Administration; State of the Art Reviews

ABSTRACT

This paper examines changes in school administration over the past 15 years. Five sections explore the ferment in educational administration and focus on the causes of unrest in the field. It looks at key markers on the path to reform in the academic arm of the profession; major changes in the profession, in general, and in the way school leaders are educated, in particular; and developments in the field and in reform work. The text highlights three issues: (1) Educational administration's relatively short history gives reason for hope; (2) the evolving new core for school administration is that it does not necessitate revolutionary change in the profession; and (3) the best way to develop confidence in a system is to see how effectual it is in practice. The field has been marked with considerable energy, but rather than leading to a consensus, the efforts have lead to fragmentation. The paper claims that the profession needs a center or core, and it offers an array of strategies that have given meaning to the profession over time. It concludes that a collective attack employing the full assortment of methods of understanding school administration will more likely lead to increased paradigm enlargement than to professional coherence. (Contains approximately 250 references.) (RJM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 433 620

The Quest for a Center: Notes on the State of the Profession of Educational Leadership

Joseph Murphy

Vanderbilt University

American Educational Research Association

April 1999, Montreal

Invited Address

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Murphy

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

I. Introduction

> Whatever the causes, the profession is confronted with fragmentation; the challenge facing the field is how to deal with it. (Campbell, Fleming, Newell, & Bennion, 1987, p. 207)

> Patently, the assessments one makes of educational administration depend in great part on what one values and sees as important and on whether one tends to be optimistic or pessimistic in looking at the world. (Willower, 1988, p. 729)

First of all, I would like to thank AERA President Alan Schoenfeld and AERA Program Chair Geoffrey Saxe for the opportunity to speak here today. I would also like to thank you for coming to the session. Finally, I want to thank my colleagues on the stage--Karen Seashore Louis, Martha McCarthy, and Diana Pounder--who have agreed to participate in this session. The objective of AERA for this session is twofold: (1) to highlight critical issues regarding the needs and development of the profession of school administration and (2) to build a base for dialogue and action around the preparation and professional development of school administrators. My hope is that you will conclude that the presentation and the accompanying paper help meet these goals.

Let me complete three additional tasks in this introduction. First, an advance organizer for the paper in the form of a thesis is established. Second, the structure of the paper is exposed. Third, some general contextual notes are provided. The thesis is as follows:

1. We are in the midst of an era of ferment in the development of the profession of school administration.

2. We are on the way and traveling fast. Unfortunately, while some important progress has been realized, we have not always had a clear sense of where we are going.
3. We need a new center of gravity for the profession. Indeed, much of work in this period of ferment can be characterized as a search for a much needed, defining core for the profession.
4. There is some evidence that the new core for the profession may grow from the seeds of school improvement and social justice.
5. For reasons discussed later, school improvement provides a particularly appropriate foundation for school administration.

The paper itself is comprised of five sections. Following this introduction, we examine the era of ferment in educational administration, looking particularly at the causes of unrest in the field. Next, we outline key markers on the path to reform in the academic arm of the profession since the release of the 1987 National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (NCEEA) report, Leaders for America's Schools. Following that, we analyze major changes in the profession in general and in the way school leaders are educated in particular. In the closing section, we apply a critical lens to developments in the field and to reform work over the last dozen years, and in the process, we posit a new core for educational leadership.

In terms of contextual notes, at least three issues merit attention. First, while there has been a good deal of legitimate critique about the profession, the storyline is not all bleak. It is important to remember that the profession of school administration is only about 50

years old, or as Achilles (1994) captures it, "The tradition of E[ducational] A[dministration] is relatively brief" (p. 10). As with other professions at a similar point in development, it is premature to make summative assessments. In short, I agree with Campbell and his colleagues (1987): "There is more reason for hope than despair. But there is much work to be done" (p. 213). My guess is that we probably have enough critique piled up about the state of the profession at its transition point of development. Critical analysis has become almost a cottage industry--a new area of study, if you will. We should heed Larry Cremin's (1961) reminder that "a protest is not a program" (p. 334). Second, I want to make it explicit that my understanding about this evolving new core for school administration is that it does not necessitate revolutionary change in the profession. I agree with Dan Griffiths (1999) that change in school administration will almost always be incremental. At the same time, you can have random incremental change or focused incremental change. And you can focus incremental change in a variety of ways. In short, we do need to take one step at a time. Yet it matters profoundly in which direction we start walking. Third, as Linda Lotto (1983) has reminded us, "Believing is seeing." I have tried to attend to that bit of wisdom throughout the analysis. At the same time, I am well aware that others may reach different conclusions as they sift through the information exammined for this report. In short, I acknowledge freely that my beliefs about what is best for the profession color the analysis, especially in the concluding part of the paper.

II. The Era of Ferment[1]

> It appears to some analysts of school administration that we are in the midst of [a] round of great ferment--one that is accompanying the transition from the scientific to . . . the dialectic era. (Murphy, 1993a, p. 1)
>
> Recent major developments in educational administration may reasonably be characterized as a succession of attempts to challenge one or more of the assumptions of traditional science of administration. (Evers & Lakomski, 1996b, p. 383)

A central theme of our work over the last 15 years has been that school administration is in the intersection between its past and its future, that it is struggling to loosen the bonds and routines that defined the profession from the mid-1950s to the mid-1980s during the theory movement (Murphy, 1992; 1993a; Murphy, 1999b). While it is not clear to what extent those ties will be broken and, if they are, how the profession might be reconfigured, what is certain is that considerable effort applied in a relatively concerted manner has been directed to the reform of school administration over the last two decades. Indeed, we argue that the period defining the transition from the behavioral science era has been the most intense time of reform activity we have seen in school administration. It is also our position that although the current era of turmoil was foreshadowed by analysts almost at the same time that the theory movement broke over the profession (Culbertson, 1963; Harlow, 1962) and although it began to pick up momentum in the 1970s with the publication of T. B. Greenfield's (1975) insightful critique, it was not until the mid-1980s that the balance was tipped toward widespread critique and large-scale reform. Here, we briefly overview the reasons why the comfort of the status quo was thrown into question--

borrowing freely from our earlier analyses in this area (Murphy, 1992; 1996; 1999b). Arguments are grouped into two clusters, those focusing on reform pressures brought about by the changing environment and those emanating from critical analyses of the profession itself.

The Changing Environment of School Administration

> One of the important things we know about leadership is that how we answer some of the most frequently asked questions about it depends on our assumptions about the nature of society and social organizations. (Slater, 1995, p. 469)
>
> To fully understand . . . university programs that prepare school leaders, it is necessary to explore the external forces that have helped to shape them. (McCarthy, 1999, p. 119)

In the next section, we examine forces internal to the academic arm of educational administration that are encouraging the profession to redefine itself. While that is where the bulk of reform attention has been focused to date, it is important to emphasize that school administration is also finding it necessary to reshape itself in response to changing conditions in the environment--forces that regardless of the internal health of the profession, demand a rethinking of the business known as school leadership. We review two sets of dynamics in this section--environmental forces associated with the evolution to a post-industrial world for the education industry and forces changing the nature of schooling of which school administration is a part.

The Evolution to a Post-Industrial World

The changing economic fabric. It is almost a fundamental law that the economy is undergoing a significant metamorphosis as we head into the 21st century. There is widespread agreement that we have been and continue to be moving from an industrial to a post-industrial or information economy (Cibulka, 1999). Key aspects of the new economy include: the globalization of economic activity, the demise of the mass-production economy, a privileging of information technology, an increase in the skills required to be successful, and an emphasis on the service dimensions of the marketplace (Marshall & Tucker, 1992). It is also becoming clear to many analysts that with the arrival of the post-industrial society, "we are seeing the dissolution of the social structure associated with traditional industrialism" (Hood, 1994, p. 12). The ascent of the global economy has brought an emphasis on new markets, "a loosening of the constraints of the labor market" (Dahrendorf, 1995, p. 21), and a "break[ing] of the state monopoly on the delivery of human services so that private enterprise can expand" (Lewis, 1993, p. 84). Along with these have come increasing deinstitutionalization, deregulation, and privatization.

There is a growing belief that "free market economics provide the path to prosperous equilibrium" (Thayer, 1987, p. 168)--a belief in "the assumption that left to itself economic interaction between rationally self-interested individuals in the market will spontaneously yield broad prosperity, social harmony, and all other manner of public and private good" (Himmelstein, 1983, p. 16). Supported by market theory and theories of the firm and by the public choice literature, there is a "new spirit of enterprise in the air" (Hardin, 1989, p. 16)--a renewed interest in "private market values" (Bailey, 1987, p. 141) and in the "virtues of

private property" (Hirsch, 1991, p. 2) and a "promarket trend" (President's Commission on Privatization, 1988, p. 237) in the larger society. A view of individuals as "economic free agents" (Murnane & Levy, 1996, p. 229) is finding widespread acceptance.

While analysts are quick to point out the fallacy of this emerging belief in the infallibility of markets, there is little doubt that current alterations in the economic foundations of society are anchored firmly on a "belief in the superiority of free market forms of social organization over the forms of social organization of the Keynesian welfare state society" (Ian Taylor, cited in Martin, 1993, p. 48). As Starr (1991) notes, this expanding reliance on the market moves individuals in the direction of "exercis[ing] choice as consumers rather than as citizens" (p. 27). This evolution from government to markets has profound implications for education writ large and for emerging conceptions of schooling and school leadership.

Shifting social and political dynamics. In the previous section, we addressed the changing economic substructures of a post-industrial state. In this section, we examine the shifting social and political foundations of the democratic welfare state that in turn act to help redefine the education industry and our understanding of school leadership.

The political and social environment appears to be undergoing important changes. There has been a loosening of the bonds of democracy (Barber, 1984). Thus, according to a number of scholars, "our American democracy is faltering" (Elshtain, 1995, p. 1), with a concomitant "loss . . . to our ways of living and working together and to our view of the worth of the individual" (Tomlinson, 1986, p. 211). The infrastructure of civil society also

has been impaired. Analysts discern fairly significant tears in the fabric known as "modern civil society" (Dahrendorf, 1995, p. 23).

As a consequence of these basic shifts--the weakening of democracy and the deterioration of civil society, especially in conjunction with the ideological space that they share with economic fundamentalism--important sociopolitical trends have begun to emerge: (1) "a growing sense of personal insecurity" (Dahrendorf, 1995, p. 26), "unrest in the populace at large" (Liebman & Wuthnow, 1983, p. 3), and a less predictable "worldlife" (Hawley, 1995, pp. 741-742); (2) "the destruction of important features of community life" (Dahrendorf, 1995, p. 26); (3) shifts in the boundaries--both real and symbolic--between the state and alternative sociopolitical structures (Liebman, 1983a); and (4) an expanding belief that the enhancement of social justice through collective action, especially public action, is unlikely (Whitty, 1984).

The composite picture of self-destruction has been labeled "The Disunity of America" by Dahrendorf (1995, p. 23) and characterized as "the weakening . . . of the world known as democratic civil society" by Elshtain (1995, p. 2). One strand of this evolving sociopolitical mosaic is plummeting public support for government (Cibulka, 1999). In many ways, Americans "have disengaged psychologically from politics and governance" (Putnam, 1995, p. 68): "The growth of cynicism about democratic government shifts America toward, not away from, a more generalized norm of disaffection" (Elshtain, 1995, p. 25). As Hawley (1995) chronicles, "Citizens are becoming increasingly alienated from government and politics. They do not trust public officials" (p. 741), and they are skeptical of the bureaucratic quagmire of professional control.

A second pattern in the mosaic is defined by issues of poverty (Cibulka, 1999; Reyes, Wagstaff, & Fusarelli, 1999). Many analysts, for example, have detailed the "concept and the phenomenon of the underclass" (Dahrendorf, 1995, p. 24) or the "trend toward private wealth and public squalor" (Bauman, 1996, p. 627). According to Dahrendorf (1995), this economically grounded trend represents a new type of social exclusion--the "systematic divergence of the life chances for large social groups" (p. 24). He and others are quick to point out that this condition seriously undermines the health of society: "Poverty and unemployment threaten the very fabric of civil society. . . . Once these [work and a decent standard of living] are lost by a growing number of people, civil society goes with them" (pp. 25-26).

Consistent with this description of diverging life chances is a body of findings on the declining social welfare of children and their families (Reyes et al., 1999). These data reveal a society populated increasingly by groups of citizens that historically have not fared well in this nation, especially ethnic minorities and citizens for whom English is a second language. Concomitantly, the percentage of youngsters affected by the ills of the world in which they live, for example, poverty, unemployment, illiteracy, crime, drug addiction, malnutrition, poor physical health, is increasing.

According to Himmelstein (1983), society is best pictured as "a web of shared values and integrating institutions that bind individuals together and restrain their otherwise selfish, destructive drives" (p. 16). Some reviewers have observed a noticeable attenuation of these social bonds, or what Elshtain (1995) describes as a "loss of civil society--a kind of evacuation of civic spaces" (p. 5). The splintering of shared values and the accompanying

diminution in social cohesiveness have been discussed by Dahrendorf (1995) and Mayberry (1991), among others. Few, however, have devoted as much attention to the topic of changing patterns of civic engagement and political participation as Robert Putnam (1995). According to Putnam, the "democratic disarray" (p. 77) that characterizes society and the polity can be "linked to a broad and continuing erosion of civic engagement that began a quarter-century ago" (p. 77). After examining citizen involvement across a wide array of areas, e.g., participation in politics, union membership, volunteerism in civic and fraternal organizations, participation in organized religion, he drew the following conclusion:

> By almost every measure, Americans' direct engagement in politics and government has fallen steadily and sharply over the last generation, despite the fact that average levels of education--the best individual-level predictor of political participation--have risen sharply throughout this period. Every year over the last decade or two, millions more have withdrawn from the affairs of their communities. (p. 68)

Another piece of the story, related to the themes of declining social cohesion and political abstinence but even more difficult to ignore, is the issue of "social breakdown and moral decay" (Himmelstein, 1983, p. 15) or rents in the "sociomoral" (Liebman, 1983b, p. 229) tapestry of society. Of particular concern is the perception that state actions have contributed to the evolution of social mores that are undermining the adhesiveness that has traditionally held society together--that "the welfare bureaucracy is irreversibly opposed to the established social morality" (Gottfried, 1993, p. 86).

The ideological footings of the emerging sociopolitical infrastructure are only dimly visible at this time. The one piece of the foundation that shines most brightly is what

Tomlinson (1986) describes as the "ascendancy of the theory of the social market" (p. 211)--a theory that is anchored on the "supreme value [of] individual liberty" (p. 211). This emerging "high regard for personal autonomy, or liberty" (Gottfried, 1993, pp. xiv-xv) is both an honoring of individualization and a discrediting of collective action (Donahue, 1989; Katz, 1971). Social market theory suggests a "reduced role for government, greater consumer control, and a belief in efficiency and individuality over equity and community" (Bauman, 1996, p. 627). According to Whitty (1984), it includes the privileging of private over public delivery and "the restoration of decisions that have been made by professional experts over the last few decades to the individuals whose lives are involved" (p. 53). While critics of social market theory and glorified individualism foresee "a weakening of democratic participation [and] social cohesion" (Tomlinson, 1986, p. 211), advocates contend that "the individual pursuit of self interest is not a threat to the social bond, but its very basis" (Himmelstein, 1983, p. 16).

The Changing Nature of Schooling

As is the case with other organizations, schools are currently fighting to transform the way they think and act. From the collective effort of those who describe this change, a new vision of education quite unlike the "center of production" (Barth, 1986, p. 295) image that has shaped schooling throughout the industrial age is being portrayed. Embedded in this emerging view of tomorrow's schools are three central alterations: (a) at the institutional level, a rebalancing of the equation that adds more weight to market and citizen control while subtracting influence from government and professional actors; (b) at the managerial level, a change from a bureaucratic operational system to more communal views of schooling; and

(c) at the technical level, a change from behavioral to social-constructivist views of learning and teaching. Each of these fundamental shifts leads to different ways of thinking about the profession of school administration and the education of school leaders (Louis & Murphy, 1994; Murphy & Louis, 1999a).

Reinventing governance. Most analysts of the institutional level of schooling--the interface of the school with its larger (generally immediate) environment--argue that the industrial approach to education led to a "cult of professionalism" (Sarason, 1994, p. 84) and to the "almost complete separation of schools from the community and, in turn, discouragement of local community involvement in decision making related to the administration of schools" (Burke, 1992, p. 33) and helped "marginalize parents as co-producers of their children's learning" (Consortium on Productivity in the Schools, 1995, p. 57). Critiques of extant governance systems center on two topics: (1) frustration with the government-professional monopoly and (2) critical analyses of the basic governance infrastructure--bureaucracy.

Most chroniclers of the changing governance structures in restructuring schools envision the demise of schooling as a sheltered government monopoly heavily controlled by professionals (Murphy, 1999a, in press). In its stead, they forecast the emergence of a system of schooling driven by economic and political forces that substantially increase the saliency of market and democratic dynamics (see Murphy, 1996). Embedded in this conception are a number of interesting dynamics. One of the key elements involves a recalibration of the locus of control based on what Ross (1988) describes as "a review and reconsideration of the division of existing responsibilities and functions" (p. 2) among levels

of government. Originally called "democratic localism" (p. 305) by Katz (1971), it has more recently come to be known simply as localization or, more commonly, decentralization. However it is labeled, it represents a backlash against "the thorough triumph of a centralized and bureaucratic form of educational organization" (p. 305) and governance and an antidote for the feeling that "America has lost its way in education because America has disenfranchised individual local schools" (Guthrie, 1997, p. 34).

A second ideological foundation can best be thought of as a recasting of democracy, a replacement of representative governance with more populist conceptions, especially what Cronin (1989) describes as direct democracy. While we use the term more broadly than does Cronin, our conception shares with his a grounding in: (1) the falling fortunes of representative democracy, (2) a "growing distrust of legislative bodies . . . [and] a growing suspicion that privileged interests exert far greater influence on the typical politician than does the common voter" (p. 4), and (3) recognition of the claims of its advocates that greater direct voice will produce important benefits for society--that it "could enrich citizenship and replace distrust of government with respect and healthy participation" (p. 48).

A third foundation encompasses a rebalancing of the governance equation in favor of lay citizens while diminishing the power of the state and (in some ways) educational professionals. This line of ideas emphasizes parental empowerment by honoring what Sarason (1994) labels "the political principle" and by recognizing the "historic rights of parents in the education of their children" (Gottfried, 1993, p. 109). It is, at times, buttressed by a strong strand of anti-professionalism that subordinates "both efficiency and

organizational rationality to an emphasis on responsiveness, close public [citizen] control, and local involvement" (Katz, 1971, p. 306).

The ideology of choice is a fourth pillar that will likely support the rebuilt edifice of school governance (Bauman, 1996). Sharing a good deal of space with the concepts of localism, direct democracy, and lay control, choice is designed to "deregulate the demand side of the education market" (Beers & Ellig, 1994, p. 35) and to "enable parents to become more effectively involved in the way the school is run" (Hakim, Seidenstat, & Bowman, 1994, p. 13). It means that "schools would be forced to attend to student needs and parent preferences rather than to the requirements of a centralized bureaucracy" (Hill, 1994, p. 76).

Finally, it seems likely that something that might best be thought of as democratic professionalism will form a central part of the infrastructure of school governance in the post-industrial world. What this means is the gradual decline of control by elite professionals--by professional managers and more recently by teacher unions--that characterized governance in the industrial era of schooling. While schools in the industrial era have been heavily controlled by professionals, they have not provided a role for the average teacher in governance. Indeed, under elite democracy and managerial centralization that defined school governance for the past century, teachers were explicitly denied influence. This view of front line workers is inconsistent with both human capitalism and emerging portraits of post-industrial schooling. It is not surprising, therefore, that the call for an enhanced voice for teachers is a central element in much of the current reform debate. It is also likely to become a key pillar in school governance for tomorrow's schools.

Reinventing systems of organization. Over the last few decades, "critics have argued that the reforms of the Progressive Era produced bureaucratic arteriosclerosis, insulation from parents and patrons, and the low productivity of a declining industry protected as a quasi monopoly" (Tyack, 1993, p. 3). There is growing sentiment that the existing structure of administration is "obsolete and unsustainable" (Rungeling & Glover, 1991, p. 415), that the "bureaucratic structure is failing in a manner so critical that adaptations will not forestall its collapse" (Clark & Meloy, 1989, p. 293). Behind this basic critique is the belief that schools have become dominated by producers and that students are not being well served. It is increasingly being concluded that the existing bureaucratic system of education with its "dead hand of central administration" (Jenks, 1966, p. 27) is "incapable of addressing the technical and structural shortcomings of the public educational system" (Lawton, 1991, p. 4).

More finely-grained criticism of the bureaucratic infrastructure of schooling comes from a variety of quarters. Some reformers maintain "that school bureaucracies, as currently constituted could [never] manage to provide high-quality education" (Elmore, 1993, p. 37) and that, even worse, "bureaucratic management practices have been causing unacceptable distortions in educational process" (Wise, 1989, p. 301), that they are "paralyzing American education . . . [and] getting in the way of children's learning" (Sizer, 1984, p. 206). Some analysts believe that bureaucracy is counterproductive to the needs and interests of educators within the school--"that it is impractical, and it does not fit the psychological and personal needs of the workforce" (Clark & Meloy, 1989, p. 293), that it "undermine[s] the authority of teachers" (Sackney & Dibski, 1992, p. 2), and that it is "incompatible with the professional organization" (p. 4). Still other critics suggest that bureaucratic management is

inconsistent with the sacred values and purposes of education--they question "fundamental ideological issues pertaining to bureaucracy's meaning in a democratic society" (Campbell et al., 1987, p. 73). Finally, some analysts who contend that the rigidities of bureaucracy, by making schools "almost impenetrable by citizens and unwieldy to professionals" (Candoli, 1991, p. 31), impede the ability of parents and citizens to govern and reform schooling (Sarason, 1994).

As might be expected, given this tremendous attack on the basic organizational infrastructure of schooling, stakeholders at all levels are arguing that "ambitious, if not radical, reforms are required to rectify this situation" (Elmore, 1993, p. 34), that "the excessively centralized, bureaucratic control of . . . schools must end" (Carnegie Forum, cited in Hanson, 1991, pp. 2-3):

In its place, reformers are arguing for decentralized decision making and greater local control (Murphy & Beck, 1995) and for "policies . . . that unleash productive local initiatives" (Guthrie, 1986, p. 306). The emerging alternative vision of administration for tomorrow's schools includes methods of organizing and managing schools that are generally consistent with the "quiet revolution [in] organizational and administrative theory in Western societies" (Foster, 1988, p. 71). In the still-forming image of schools for the 21st century, hierarchical, bureaucratic organizational structures give way to systems that are more organic and more decentralized--systems that "suggest a new paradigm for school organization and management" (Mulkeen, 1990, p. 105). Of particular salience in this domain has been the evolution to more community-anchored conceptions of school organizations (Beck, 1994; Beck & Foster, 1999; Sergiovanni, 1993). As with governance, these changes in our

understandings of school organizations have important implications for post-scientific era conceptions of administration and for the education of school leaders.

Reinventing learning and teaching. From the onset of the industrial revolution, education in the United States has been largely defined by a behavioral psychology-based model of learning--a model that fits nicely with the bureaucratic system of school organization. This viewpoint in turn nurtured the development of the factory and medical practice models of instruction which have dominated schooling throughout the twentieth century. Under these two models, the belief that the role of schooling is to sort students into the able and less able--those who would work with their heads and those who would work with their hands--has become deeply embedded into the fabric of schooling. According to Osin and Lesgold (1996), the perspectives noted above have "left the world with a maladaptive view of learning" (p. 623).

What is important here is the growing belief that we are "in the midst of redefining, even recreating conceptions of learning and teaching in schools" (Prestine, 1995, p. 140), i.e., a shift in the operant model of learning is a fundamental dynamic of the struggle to redefine schools. Of real significance, if rarely noted, is the fact that this new model reinforces the democratic tenets embedded in the post-industrial views of governance organization discussed above. The behavioral psychology-based model that highlights the innate capacity of the learner is being challenged by notions of constructivism and situated learning (Cohen, 1988; Prawat & Peterson, 1999; Rowan, 1995) and by the components of authentic pedagogy (Newmann & Wehlage, 1995). As Prawat and Peterson (1999) inform us, "Social constructivism represents more than an addition to the traditional, individualistic

perspective that has dominated research on learning for most of this century. It . . . represents a dramatically different approach to learning, requiring fundamental changes in how . . . educators think about the process (p. 203). Under this approach to learning, schools which historically have been in the business of promoting student adaptation to the existing social order are being transformed to ensure that they "help the vast majority of young people reach levels of skill and competence once thought within the reach of only a few" (National Commission on Teaching & America's Future [NCTAF], 1996, p. 8).

The emerging redefinition of teaching means that teachers, historically organized to carry out instructional designs and to implement curricular materials developed from afar, begin to exercise considerably more control over their profession and the routines of the workplace. Analysts see this reorganization playing out in a variety of ways at the school level. At the most fundamental level, teachers have a much more active voice in developing the goals and purposes of schooling--goals that act to delimit or expand the conception of teaching itself. They also have a good deal more to say about the curricular structures and pedagogical approaches employed in their schools (Newmann & Wehlage, 1995)--"influences over the basic elements of instructional practice (time, material, student engagement, and so forth)" (Elmore, 1989, p. 20). Finally, teachers demonstrate more control over the supporting ingredients of schooling--such as budgets, personnel, and administration--that affect the way they carry out their responsibilities.

Advocates of transformational change also see teaching becoming a more collegial activity (Newmann & Wehlage, 1995). Isolation, so deeply ingrained in the structure and culture of the profession, gives way to more collaborative efforts among teachers

(Hargreaves, 1994). At the macro level, teachers are redefining their roles to include collaborative management of the profession, especially providing direction for professional standards. At a more micro level, new organizational structures are being created to nurture the development of professional community (Louis & Kruse, 1996; Sykes, 1999)--to allow teachers to plan and teach together, to make important decisions about the nature of their roles, and to engage in school-based learning initiatives.

As was the case with governance and organization, new views of learning and teaching call for quite different understandings of school leadership and of the role of universities in preparing school administrators.

Consternation Within the Profession: Meltdown of the Core

> The criticism of present-day administrators and their preparation are loud and clear and the demand for reform is heard on all sides. (Griffiths, 1998b, p. 8)

In addition to pressures from the environment, a good deal of internal soul searching also anchored calls for the reform of school administration. As has been the case in other major periods of change in the profession, these concerns were centered on the two core dimensions of the academy: (1) the intellectual infrastructure supporting the profession, including the research methods used as scaffolding in the construction process, and (2) the methods and procedures used to educate school leaders.

Questions About the Intellectual Infrastructure

> Perhaps the most privileged trophy of all is the so-called "knowledge base" of the discipline, that defined "core" which represents the most sacred intellectual ground of all because it represents what the field believes itself to be. (English, 1997, p. 5)

In this section, we examine what appears to be an irreparable gash in the fabric of the profession that has acted as a catalyst for the rising turmoil in school administration as well as for the efforts to reshape the profession. We refer specifically to attacks from a variety of quarters on the administration-as-science intellectual foundations that grounded the profession from the mid-1950s through the mid-1980s.

Although over the life of the theory movement the profession "increased in formality, structure, and complexity, much as did the school system--from amateur to professional, from simple to complicated, and from intuitive to 'scientific'" (Cooper & Boyd, 1987, p. 7)--the outcomes of the quest for a science of administration were considerably less robust than had been anticipated (Donmoyer, 1999). By the mid-1970s, this failure of the theory movement to deliver on its promises was brought to a head in a landmark paper delivered by T. B. Greenfield (1975) at the Third International Intervisitation program in Bristol, England (Griffiths, 1988a). Although other scholars had been drawing attention to the limitations of a near-exclusive emphasis on a scientific approach to training for some time, Greenfield unleashed the first systemic broadside attack on the central tenets of the theory movement, especially on its epistemological roots and guiding values. In a word, he found the scientific era of educational administration to be impoverished. Greenfield's paper went a long way in galvanizing critique of the field that began to wash over the profession in the mid-1980s.

Over the past quarter century, other thoughtful analysts have joined the debate about the appropriate value structure and cognitive base for educational administration (see Donmoyer, 1999, for a review; also Donmoyer, Imber, & Scheurich, 1995). On the knowledge base issue, there has been increasing agreement--although with noticeable

differences in explanations--that "a body of dependable knowledge about educational administration" (Crowson & McPherson, 1987, p. 48) did not emerge during the behavioral science era. This condition means that upon exiting the behavioral science era, there was not much "conceptual unity" to the field (Erickson, 1979, p. 9).[2] In practical terms, Erickson concluded that "the field consist[ed] of whatever scholars associated with university programs in 'educational administration' consider[ed] relevant. It is, to say the least, amorphous" (p. 9). In his review, Boyan (1988a) concurred, arguing that "the explanatory aspect of the study of administrator behavior in education over 30 years appears to be an incomplete anthology of short stories connected by no particular story line or major themes" (p. 93). Given this absence of conceptual unity, there has not been much common agreement about the appropriate foundation for the profession, either. Thus, as the behavioral science era drew to a close, Goldhammer (1983) reported that although there were "general areas of concern that might dictate to preparatory institutions the names of courses that should be taught, . . . there [was] less agreement on what the content of such courses should actually be" (p. 269).

At the same time, a pattern of criticism was forming about both the definition of legitimate knowledge and the accepted ways in which it could be generated. As Crowson and McPherson (1987) reported, during this transition phase, critics "questioned with increasing vigor the appropriateness of traditional research methods and assumptions as a guide to an understanding of practice" (p. 48). Analysts called for both relegitimization of practice-based knowledge and the acceptance of:

> An increasing diversity of research methods, including attempts at qualitative ethnographic, naturalistic, phenomenological, and critical studies . . . [and] an effort to generate "theories of practice" that incorporate both objective and subjective ways of knowing, both fact and value considerations, both "is" and "ought" dimensions of education within integrated frameworks for practice. (Silver, 1982, pp. 56, 53)

Finally, there was a deepening recognition that the knowledge base employed in preparation programs had not been especially useful in solving real problems in the field. This questioning of the relevance of theory to practice can be traced to a number of causes. Deeply ingrained methods of working that assumed that one could discover theory that would automatically apply itself to situations of practice was the first. A second was the emergence of a "parochial view of science" (Halpin, 1960, p. 6)--one in which social scientists became "intent upon aping the more prestigious physical scientists in building highly abstract, theoretical models" (p. 6) at the expense of clinical science. A third was the proclivity of educational researchers employing social and behavioral sciences to contribute to the various disciplines rather than to administrative practice--administrative "structure and process were studied mostly as a way of adding to disciplinary domains" (Erickson, 1977, p. 136). "Indeed, the evolution of the field of educational administration reveals a pattern of attempts to resemble and be accepted by the more mature disciplines on campus" (Björk & Ginsberg, 1995, p. 23). Along these same lines, during this entire era, there was a lack of effort on the part of professors to distinguish systematically those aspects of the social and behavioral sciences that were most appropriate for practitioners (Gregg, 1969). In particular, insufficient attention was directed toward educational organizations as the setting for

administration and leadership (W. D. Greenfield, 1995). Largely because of the overwhelming nature of the task (Culbertson, 1965), the weakness of the theory movement noted by the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) in 1960--the failure "to work out the essentials in the social sciences for school administrators and to develop a program containing these essentials" (p. 57)--was still a problem as the sun set on the behavioral science era. It remains a problem for the field as we embark on a new millennium.

A number of critics have also pointed out that regardless of its usefulness, the knowledge base constructed during the scientific era gave rise to a "narrowly defined concept of administration" (T. B. Greenfield, 1988, p. 147). This line of analysis spotlights the failure of the profession to include critical concepts, materials, and ideas (Donmoyer, 1999). To begin with, by taking a "neutral posture on moral issues" (Culbertson, 1964, p. 311), the theory "actively de-centered morality and values in the quest for a science of organization" (English, 1997, p. 18). When the term value judgment did surface, it was "frequently as an epithet indicating intellectual contempt" (Harlow, 1962, p. 66). Throughout the behavioral science era, there was "little serious, conscious effort to develop demonstrably in students the skills or behavioral propensities to act in ways that could be considered ethical" (Farquhar, 1981, p. 199). Attention to the "humanities as a body of 'aesthetic wisdom' capable of contributing its own unique enrichment to the preparation of school administrators" (Popper, 1982, p. 12) was conspicuous by its absence.

Also neglected during this period of administration qua administration were educational issues--a phenomenon exacerbated by efforts to professionalize administration and

thereby distinguish it from teaching. What W. A. Anderson and Lonsdale reported in 1957--that "few items in the literature of educational administration. . . say much about the psychology of learning" (p. 429)--and what Boyan concluded in 1963--that "the content of the advanced preparation tends to focus on the managerial and institutional dimensions as compared to teaching, the technical base of educational organizations" (pp. 3-4)--were equally true in 1987.

In summary, by the early 1990s, a multifaceted assessment of the intellectual foundations of the profession had produced a good deal of disquiet in the profession (Donmoyer, Imber, & Scheurich, 1995). This unease, in turn, has continually fueled the turmoil which still characterizes the academic wing of the field. It has also served--both directly and indirectly--as a springboard for many of the reform initiatives that have sprung up in the current era of ferment in the profession.

Concerns About Preparation Programs

> The time has obviously come, I submit, for a fundamental, sweeping reassessment of our training program. (Erickson, 1977, p. 137)
>
> Since the late 1980s there have been calls for reform in nearly every aspect of the preparation of school leaders and admonitions that universities may be replaced . . . unless their programs are substantially transformed. (McCarthy, 1999, p. 135)
>
> The need for critical examination of educational administration preparation programs is obvious. Although changes are being undertaken by some departments, they are minimal, incremental, and lack a wholistic, referent view of the field. (Björk & Ginsberg, 1995, p. 19)

The current era of ferment is fueled not only by critique of the intellectual foundations of the profession but also by critical reviews of preparation programs for school leaders (see, for example, Griffiths, Stout, & Forsyth, 1988a; Murphy, 1990c, 1992). Reviewers have chronicled a system of preparing school leaders that is seriously flawed and that has been found wanting in nearly every aspect. Specifically, critics have uncovered serious problems in: (a) the ways students are recruited and selected into training programs; (b) the education they receive once there--including the content emphasized and the pedagogical strategies employed; (c) the methods used to assess academic fitness; and (d) the procedures developed to certify and select principals and superintendents. Our review focuses on concerns that helped fuel the emergence of the current era of ferment in the mid to late 1980s.

Recruitment and selection. Analysts of the recruitment and selection processes employed in the mid-1980s by institutions in the administrator training business consistently found them lacking in rigor. Procedures were often informal, haphazard, and casual. Prospective candidates were often self-selected, and there were few leader recruitment programs. Fewer than 10% of students reported that they were influenced by the recruitment activities of the training institutions. Despite well-documented, if commonsensical, reminders that training outcomes depended on the mix of program experiences and the quality of entering students, research on the recruitment of school administrators was quite anemic (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1988; Miklos, 1988).

Standards for selecting students into preparation programs were often perfunctory: "Most programs ha[d] 'open admissions,' with a baccalaureate degree the only prerequisite"

(Griffiths, Stout, & Forsyth, 1988b, p. 290); "For too many administrator preparation programs, any body is better than no body" (Jacobson, 1990, p. 35). The University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA)-sponsored study of the mid-1970s (Silver, 1978a) discovered that the rejection rates to preparation programs were quite low--about 12% for master's students, 14% for sixth-year students, and 25% for doctoral students. In 1984, Gerritz, Koppich, & Guthrie found that only about 1 in 30 applicants was denied admission to certification programs in California. Part of the reason for this nonselectivity can be traced to the use of questionable methods and procedures and to poorly articulated standards for entry. If all one needed 50 years ago to enter a training program in educational administration was a "B.A. and the case to pay tuition" (Tyack & Cummings, 1977, p. 60), the situation was not much improved as the profession took stock of itself in the mid-1980s.

It is not surprising that the quality of applicants is, and has been for some time, rather low. In 1988, for instance, Griffiths (1988b) revealed that "of the 94 intended majors listed in [the] Guide to the Use of the Graduate Record Examination Program 1985-86 . . . educational administration is fourth from the bottom" (p. 12). This lack of rigorous recruitment and selection procedures and criteria has several negative effects:

> First, it lowers the level of training and experience possible, since courses are often geared to the background and intelligence of the students. Second, "eased entry downgrades the status of the students in the eyes of the populace." Third, the candidates themselves realize that anyone can get in and that nearly everyone will get the license if he or she just keeps paying for credits. In part, this lack of rigor at entry reflects a lack of clear criteria for training or clear vision of what candidates

and graduates will look like, and the realization that the graduate school experience itself is not very demanding. (Cooper & Boyd, 1987, p. 14)

This lack of rigor was believed to be contributing to the serious oversupply of credentialed administrators in the United States.

Program content. Turning to the content of preparation programs at the time the ferment in the profession was beginning to warm up, critical reviews revealed the following problems: the indiscriminate adoption of practices untested and uninformed by educational values and purposes; serious fragmentation; the separation of the practice and academic arms of the profession; relatively non-robust strategies for generating new knowledge; the neglect of ethics; an infatuation with the study of administration for its own sake; and the concomitant failure to address outcomes.

Critics averred that in many preparation programs "course content [was] frequently banal" (Clark, 1988, p. 5). Nor did training programs exhibit much internal consistency. Students often confronted a "confusing mélange of courses, without clear meaning, focus, or purpose" (Cooper & Boyd, 1987, p. 14; see also Achilles, 1984). There was an absence of a "continuum of knowledge and skills that become more sophisticated as one progress[ed]" (Peterson & Finn, 1985, pp. 51-52). What all this meant was "that most administrators receiv[ed] fragmented, overlapping, and often useless courses that add[ed] up to very little" (Cooper & Boyd, 1987, p. 13).

One of the most serious problems with the cognitive base in school administration training programs in the mid-1980s was the fact that it did not reflect the realities of the workplace (Lakomski, 1998; Murphy, 1990b) and, therefore, at best, was "irrelevant to the

jobs trainees assume" (Mulkeen & Cooper, 1989, p. 1) and, at worst, was "dysfunctional in the actual world of practice" (Sergiovanni, 1989, p. 18). As we reported earlier, scholars of the behavioral science era attempted to develop a science of administration. One of the effects was an exacerbation of the natural tension between the practice and academic arms of the profession. The nurturance and development of the social sciences became ends in themselves. Professors, never very gifted at converting scientific knowledge to the guidance of practice, had little motivation to improve. As a result, the theory and research borrowed from the behavioral sciences "never evolved into a unique knowledge base informing the practice of school administration" (Griffiths, 1988b, p. 19).

Mann (1975), Bridges (1977), Muth (1989), Sergiovanni (1989, 1991), and others have all written influential essays in which they describe how the processes and procedures stressed in university programs in the theory era were often diametrically opposed to conditions that characterize the workplace milieu of schools. Other thoughtful reviewers concluded that administrators-in-training were often "given a potpourri of theory, concepts, and ideas--unrelated to one another and rarely useful in either understanding schools or managing them" (Mulkeen & Cooper, 1989, p. 12). In their review of training programs at the end of the theory era, Crowson and McPherson (1987) argued that institutions "that had emphasized a solid grounding in theory, the social sciences, [and] rational decision making . . . were discovered to be well off the mark as effective preparation for the chaotic life of a principal or superintendent" (p. 49).

Evidence from nearly all fronts led to the conclusion that the focus on the behavioral sciences during the scientific era of training resulted in a glaring absence of consideration of

the problems faced by practicing school administrators (McCarthy, 1999). The pervasive antirecipe, antiskill philosophy that characterized many programs of educational administration resulted in significant gaps in the prevailing knowledge base: an almost complete absence of performance-based program components; a lack of attention to practical problem-solving skills; "a neglect of practical intelligence" (Sergiovanni, 1989, p. 17); and a truncated conception of expertise. Administrators consistently reported that the best way to improve training in preparation programs would be to improve the instruction on job-related skills (Erlandson & Witters-Churchill, 1988).

The clinical aspects of most preparation programs in educational administration at the end of the 1980s were notoriously weak. Despite an entrenched belief that supervised practice "could be the most critical phase of the administrator's preparation" (Griffiths, 1988b, p. 17) and a long history of efforts to make field-based learning an integral part of preparation programs, little progress has been made in this area. And despite concern over the impoverished nature of clinical experience for nearly 30 years, Pepper was still able to report as late as 1988 that "few, if any, university programs in school administration offer a thorough clinical experience for future school administrators" (p. 361). The field-based component continued to be infected with weaknesses that have been revisited on a regular basis since the first decade of the behavioral science revolution in administrative preparation: (a) unclear objectives; (b) inadequate number of clinical experiences; (c) activities arranged on the basis of convenience; (d) overemphasis on role-centered as opposed to problem-centered experiences; (e) lack of individualization; (f) poor planning, supervision, and follow-up; (g) absence of "connecting linkages between on-campus experiences and field-

based experiences" (Milstein, 1990, p. 121); and (h) overemphasis on low-level (orientation and passive observation type) activities (McKerrow, 1998; Milstein, 1996).

Woven deeply into the fabric of "administration as an applied science" was the belief that there was a single best approach to educating prospective school leaders (Cooper & Boyd, 1987), including a dominant world view of administration as an area of study (content) and method of acting (procedure). A number of thoughtful analysts maintained that this perspective has resulted in significant gaps in the knowledge base employed in training programs of the era. Missing was consideration of the diversity of perspectives that informed scholarship and practice. For example, in her review of the literature on women administrators, Shakeshaft (1988) discovered "differences between the ways men and women approach the tasks of administration" (p. 403). She concluded that, although "these differences have implications for administrative training programs . . . the female world of administrators has not been incorporated into the body of work in the field . . . [n]or are women's experiences carried into the literature on practice" (p. 403-406). Similar conclusions were reached about racial minorities.

One of the most troubling aspects of preparation programs of the mid-1980s was that they had very little to do with education. Most programs showed "little interest in exploring the historical roots and social context of schooling" (G. L. Anderson, 1990, p. 53) and did "a very bad job of teaching . . . a wider vision of schools in society (Mulkeen & Cooper, 1989, p. 12). Furthermore, there was ample evidence that the content in training programs was heavily influenced by the "pervasive managerial-administrative ethic" (Evans, 1998, p. 30) that undergirded the profession and that preparation programs largely ignored matters of

teaching and learning, of pedagogy and curriculum (Murphy, 1992). Most of the interest and scholarly activity of the behavioral science era heavily reinforced the "separation of problems in administration from problems in education" (T. B. Greenfield, 1988, p. 144) and the emphasis on noneducational issues in training programs. As Evans (1991) astutely chronicles, the era sponsored discourse and training primarily on "the administration of education" (p. 3), or administration qua administration--a major shift from its formative years when the emphasis "was upon the adjective 'educational' rather than upon the noun 'administration'" (Guba, 1960, p. 115). The separation of educational administration "from the phenomenon known as instruction" (Erickson, 1979, p. 10) meant that the typical graduate of a school administration training program could act only as "a mere spectator in relation to the instructional program" (Hills, 1975, p. 4).

By the early 1960s, the second major root of the field--values and ethics--like education before it, had atrophied (Beck & Murphy, 1994). The result was reduced consideration of two issues: (a) organizational values, purpose, and ethics and (b) organizational outcomes. According to Greenfield (1988), "The empirical study of administrators has eluded their moral dimensions and virtually all that lends significance to what they do" (p. 138). Despite some early notices that "educational administration requires a distinctive value framework" (Graff & Street, 1957, p. 120), despite pleas to reorient administration toward purposing (Harlow, 1962), and despite clear reminders that education is fundamentally a moral activity (Culbertson, 1963; Halpin, 1960), the issue of meaning in school administration as a profession and in its training programs had taken a back seat "to focus upon the personality traits of administrators--upon the mere characteristics of

administrators rather than upon their character" (T. B. Greenfield, 1988, pp. 137-138). Thus at the close of the theory era, administrators were exiting training programs unprepared to grapple with ethical issues or to address openly the values deeply embedded in schools that often hide behind "a mask of objectivity and impartiality" (p. 150).

As early as 1960, Chase was pointing out what was to become an increasingly problematic situation in educational administration in general and in training programs in particular--a lack of concern for outcomes. Seventeen years later, Erickson (1977) reported that studies in the field "between 1954 and 1974 provided no adequate basis for outcome-oriented organizational strategy in education" (p. 128). Two years later, Erickson (1979) expanded on the ideas of his earlier essay. He documented "the tendency to neglect the careful tracing of connections between organizational variables and student outcomes" (p. 12). He decried the focus on the characteristics of administrators at the expense of more useful work. He laid out his now famous line of attack on the problem: "The current major emphasis, in studies of organizational consequences, should be on postulated causal networks in which student outcomes are the bottom line" (p. 12). At the time of the NCEEA (1987) report, preparation programs had yet to resonate to this idea. Indeed, in their analysis using data available at the start of the current era of ferment (i.e., 1986-1987), Haller, Brent, and McNamara (1997) concluded that "taken collectively, graduate programs in educational administration seem to have little or no influence on the attributes that characterize effective schools" (p. 227; see also Brent, 1998).

Delivery system. The delivery system that shaped preparation programs at the tail end of the theory movement was marked by a number of serious problems, most of which

have a long history. Looking at the profession as a whole, it is clear that there are too many institutions involved in the training business. At the time of the NCEEA (1987) report, there were 505 institutions offering coursework in educational leadership, with "less than 200 hav[ing] the resources and commitment to provide the excellence called for by the Commission" (p. 20). Many of these programs were cash cows for their sponsoring universities, kept open more for political and economic than for educational reasons. In 1983, Willower offered this assessment of the situation: Many "offer graduate study in . . . name only. They seriously stint inquiry and survive by offering easy credentials and by working hard at legislative politics. Their faculties neither contribute to the ideas of the field nor are they actively engaged with them" (p. 194). These institutions tended to be characterized by high student-faculty ratios and limited specialization among faculty.

A related problem was the framework in which students' educational experiences unfolded: "Administrator training . . . [was] most often a dilatory option, pursued on a convenience basis, part-time, on the margins of a workday" (Sykes & Elmore, 1989, p. 80). Programs had indeed drifted far from the traditional residency model: At the end of the 1970s, Silver (1978a) reported that "the ideal of one or two years of full-time student life at the graduate level seems to be disappearing from our preparatory programs, and with it the notions of time for scholarly objectivity, student life, and colleague-like interaction between professors and students" (pp. 207-208). As many as 95 percent of all students were part-timers (Griffiths et al., 1988b), and "many students complet[ed] their training . . . without forming a professional relationship with a professor or student colleague" (Clark, 1988, p. 5).

We entered the current era of ferment with the arts and science model of education firmly entrenched in schools of education and departments of school administration to, the critics held, the detriment of the profession. According to them, this arts and science framework emerged more to help professors develop "greater academic sophistication through their professional roles in order to gain acceptance by their peers in other departments" (Goldhammer, 1983, p. 256) than to respond to the needs of prospective administrators. Unfortunately, it was clear by the mid-1980s that the model had neither furnished professors the status for which they had hoped nor provided graduates with the tools they needed in order to be successful practitioners (Björk & Ginsberg, 1995). In addition, it had driven a wedge between professors and practitioners, creating what Goldhammer (1983) labeled the "university-field gap" (p. 265).

The emulation of the arts and science model had spawned a number of sub-problems in preparation programs. One of the most serious was that education designed for practitioners (Ed.D. programs) had been molded to parallel the training provided to researchers (Ph.D. programs), in terms of both research requirements (Silver, 1978b) and general coursework (Norton & Levan, 1987). This blurring of requirements and experiences for students pursuing quite distinct careers resulted in the development of ersatz research programs for prospective practitioners. Students, burdened with a variety of inappropriate activities, were being prepared to be neither first-rate researchers nor successful practitioners.

In attempting to address the need to develop intradepartmental balance between professor-scholars attuned to the disciplines and professor-practitioners oriented to the field,

departments had by the mid-1980s generally produced the worst of both. Unclear about the proper mission of preparation programs, seeking to enhance the relatively low status afforded professors of school administration, and overburdened with multitudes of students, faculties in educational leadership were characterized by "a strong anti-intellectual bias (Griffiths, 1997), weak scholarship (McCarthy, Kuh, Newell, Iacona, 1988), problematic connections to the field (Willower, 1988), and considerable resistance to change (Cooper & Muth, 1994; McCarthy et al., 1988). A number of reviewers concluded that "only a relatively small number of those in the field of educational administration [were] actively engag[ed] in scholarly activities" (Immegart, 1990, p. 11). Even more disheartening were the assessments of the quality of the scholarship at the time (Boyan, 1981). According to Hawley (1988), because of serious limitations in their own training, many professors were not qualified to supervise research. Coupling this deficiency in ability with the previously noted lack of effort resulted in a situation in which "very little good research was being conducted by [educational administration] faculty and students" (Hawley, 1988, p. 85) and in which students developed a truncated, academic view of scholarly inquiry.

It is probably not surprising, although it is distressing, that inappropriate content ineffectively packaged was also being poorly delivered in many training institutions. "The dominant mode of instruction continu[ed] to be lecture and discussion in a classroom setting based on the use of a textbook" (Mulkeen & Tetenbaum, 1990, p. 20). Although some progress was made during the behavioral science era to infuse reality-oriented instructional strategies into preparation programs, the change was hardly revolutionary, and the use of innovative pedagogical methods was not prevalent at the close of the theory movement in

school administration. For example, in the Texas National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) study (Erlandson & Witters-Churchill, 1988), principals reported "lecture and discussion" to be the primary instructional mode used for eight of nine skill areas examined--and the ninth skill, written communication, was a close second!

Standards. Thoughtful critique of preparation programs at the time of the NCEEA (1987) report revealed that the lack of rigorous standards was a serious problem that touched almost every aspect of educational administration. Previously, we noted the general absence of standards at the point of entry into preparation programs. According to critics, once students entered preparation programs, the situation did not improve: "The quality of [their] experiences [was] often abysmally low" (Mulkeen & Cooper, 1989, p. 1). They were not exposed to rigorous coursework: "Students mov[ed] through the program without ever seeing a current research study (other than a local dissertation), without ever having read an article in ASQ or EAQ or AJS [Administrative Science Quarterly, Educational Administration Quarterly, and American Journal of Sociology, respectively]. They [were] functionally illiterate in the basic knowledge of our field" (Clark, 1988, pp. 4-5). Because performance criteria were ill-defined, there was also very little monitoring of student progress (Hawley, 1988). Not surprisingly, very few entrants into certification programs failed to complete their programs for academic reasons. Most former students indicate that their graduate training was not very rigorous (Jacobson, 1990; Muth, 1989). The delivery system most commonly employed--part-time study in the evening or on weekends--resulted in students who came to their "studies worn-out, distracted, and harried" (Mann, 1975, p. 143) and contributed to the evolution and acceptance of low standards (Hawley, 1988). Exit

requirements, in turn, were often "slack and unrelated to the work of the profession" (Peterson & Finn, 1985, p. 54). Compounding the lack of standards at almost every phase of preparation programs were university faculty who were unable or unwilling to improve the situation (Hawley, 1988; McCarthy et al., 1988). Even greater obstacles to improving standards were the bargains, compromises, and treaties that operated in preparation programs--the lowering of standards in exchange for high enrollments and compliant student behavior. By the end of the theory era, the NCEEA (1987) and the NPBEA (1989) reports and other reviews also concluded that the time had come to markedly elevate standards in school administration.

III. Markers on the Path to Reform

While it is impossible to prejudge what future historians of educational administration will designate as the major events that helped shape the profession for the post-theory era, certain events appear likely to receive considerable attention. In this section, we provide an overview of significant events of the current era of ferment as an introduction to that work (see also Forsyth, 1999; McCarthy, 1999; Thomson, 1999).

One marker that will surely be singled out is the set of activities comprising the work of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration. Growing out of the deliberations of the Executive Council of the University Council for Educational Administration, the Commission was formed in 1985 under the direction of Daniel E. Griffiths. Support for the Commission came from funds contributed by a variety of foundations in response to concerted efforts on the part of the UCEA staff. The NCEEA has produced three influential documents that have promoted considerable discussion both within

and outside educational administration: the 1987 report Leaders for America's Schools; Griffiths' highly influential address to the 1988 annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (AERA) (subsequently published as a UCEA paper [Griffiths, 1988b]); and a UCEA-sponsored edited volume containing most of the background papers commissioned by the NCEEA (Griffiths et al., 1988a). These three documents helped to crystallize the sense of what is wrong with the profession, to extend discussion about possible solutions, and, to a lesser extent, to provide signposts for those engaged in redefining school administration.

Following up on these activities, the UCEA Executive Director, Patrick Forsyth, initiated discussions with foundations and set about mustering support for one of the NCEEA recommendations--the creation of the National Policy Board of Educational Administration (NPBEA). After considerable work on the part of UCEA to forge a union among the executive directors of 10 groups with a deep-seated interest in school administration, the NPBEA was created in 1988. Its care was entrusted to David L. Clark, then a professor of Educational Leadership at the University of Virginia. The NPBEA has undertaken a series of activities designed to provide direction for the reconstruction of the academic arm of the profession. After a year of work supported by the UCEA, chaired by its Executive Director, Patrick Forsyth, and facilitated by the NPBEA Executive Secretary, David L. Clark, the NPBEA released its first report, titled Improving the Preparation of School Administrators: The Reform Agenda, in May of 1989. The report outlines an extensive overhaul and strengthening of preparation programs. Its recommendations were later adopted in slightly modified form by the 50-plus universities comprising the UCEA. Following the release of

The Reform Agenda, the NPBEA published a series of occasional papers that were designed to inform the reform debate in educational administration. It also sponsored, in conjunction with the Danforth Foundation, national conferences to help professors discover alternatives to deeply ingrained practices in training programs. Its 1992 conference on problem-based learning drew nearly 150 participants from universities throughout the United States and Canada.

Building on earlier-noted documents, two national efforts to redefine the knowledge base of the field unfolded in the early 1990s. In 1990, the National Commission for the Principalship (NCP), under the leadership of Scott D. Thomson and funded by the National Associations of Elementary School Principals and of Secondary School Principals, published a report titled Principals for Our Changing Schools: Preparation and Certification. The document represents an attempt to unpack the functional knowledge base required by principals. Working from this document, Thomson, under the aegis of the NPBEA--of which he was at the time Executive Secretary--assigned teams to flesh out each of the 21 knowledge domains identified in the report. The resulting document, Principals for Our Changing Schools: The Knowledge and Skill Base (NCP, 1993) provides a comprehensive outline of the core knowledge and skills needed by principals to lead today's schools. A year later, the UCEA authorized six writing teams under the overall direction of Wayne K. Hoy to update the knowledge bases in educational administration preparation programs.

In addition to the reform reports described earlier, change efforts have been shaped by a series of volumes devoted to the analysis and improvement of the academic arm of the profession. Each of these books has helped focus attention on the problems of the field and

has provided alternative visions for a post-theory world as well as solution paths to guide the voyage. Some of the most important of these volumes are: the first two handbooks of research in the field, AERA-sponsored volumes, edited by Boyan (1988b) and Murphy & Louis (1999)--the Handbook of Research on Educational Administration; two volumes on the professoriate, authored by Martha M. McCarthy and colleagues--a 1988 book titled Under Scrutiny: The Educational Administration Professoriate and the 1997 follow-up volume, with G. D. Kuh--Continuity and Change: The Educational Leadership Professoriate; the edited volume growing out of the NCEEA project--Leaders for America's Schools (Griffiths, Stout, & Forsyth, 1988a); the 1990 National Society for the Study of Education Yearbook--Educational Leadership and Changing Contexts of Families, Communities, and Schools (Mitchell & Cunningham, 1990); a volume resulting from the National Center for Educational Leadership conference on cognitive perspectives in school administration--Cognitive Perspectives on Educational Leadership (Hallinger, Leithwood, & Murphy, 1993); and a volume on school administration published by the Politics of Education Association and edited by Hannaway and Crowson (1989)--The Politics of Reforming School Administration.

Other books devoted primarily to the reform of the academic arm of the profession include those edited by: Murphy in 1993b--Preparing Tomorrow's School Leaders: Alternative Designs; Mulkeen, Cambron-McCabe, and Anderson in 1994--Democratic Leadership: The Changing Context of Administrative Preparation; Donmoyer, Imber, and Scheurich in 1995--The Knowledge Base in Educational Administration: Multiple Perspectives; and Leithwood and his colleagues in 1996--International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Administration; and those authored by: Beck in 1994--

Reclaiming Educational Administration as a Caring Profession; Beck and Murphy in 1994--Ethics in Educational Leadership Preparation Programs: An Expanding Role and in 1998 (Beck, Murphy, & Associates)--Ethics in Educational Leadership Programs: Emerging Models; Milstein and Associates in 1993--Changing the Way We Prepare Educational Leaders: The Danforth Experience; and Murphy in 1992--The Landscape of Leadership Preparation: Reframing the Education of School Administrators.

The initiatives of the Danforth Foundation will no doubt been seen as an important marker in this period of reform. In addition to its sponsorship of the NCEEA and its core support for the NPBEA, Danforth has underwritten four significant efforts designed to assist self-analyses and improvement efforts in educational administration, all of which capture multiple elements from the various reform volumes and documents of the late 1980s: (a) a Principals' Program to improve preparation programs for prospective leaders; (b) a Professors' Program to enhance the capability of departments to respond to needed reforms; (c) research and development efforts, such as the Problem-Based Learning Project under the direction of Philip Hallinger at Vanderbilt University, that are designing alternative approaches to understanding the profession and to educating tomorrow's leaders; and (d) a series of conferences and workshops created to help the professoriate grapple with important reform ideas in the area of preparing leaders for tomorrow's schools.

Two standards-defining activities are also likely to be heavily referenced in future reports of events shaping the evolution, and perhaps the transformation, of the profession as it moves into the 21st century. The first initiative was the development by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) of their curriculum guidelines

for school administration. This work, completed under the aegis of the NPBEA over a three-year period, brought the best thinking of the Policy Board--via Principals for Our Changing Schools: The Knowledge and Skill Base (NCP, 1993)--and the various professional associations (e.g., National Association of Elementary School Principals, American Association of School Administrators, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development) into a comprehensive framework to reshape preparation programs for school leaders. A second initiative conducted under the auspices of the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) and in cooperation with the NPBEA--the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC)--produced the first universal set of standards for school leaders. Approved in late 1996, Standards for School Leaders sets about strengthening the academic arm of the profession primarily through the manipulation of state controls over areas such as licensure, relicensure, and program approval (ISLLC, 1996).

Finally, it is likely that two additional triggering events from AERA and UCEA during this last decade will stand the test of time when the history of the profession is written. For AERA, the important event was the establishment of the Special Interest Group on Teaching in Educational Administration. For UCEA, it was the development of an annual convention. Both of these catalyzing initiatives have helped create sustained work in the service of reshaping the academic arm of the profession.

IV. The Shifting Landscape of the Profession

> Unless we know where we are going there is not so much comfort in being assured that we are on the way and traveling fast. The result is likely to be that much of our progress is but seeming. (Boyd Bode, cited in Cremin, 1961, p. 222)

In this section, we outline some of the major changes that are occurring in the field of school administration. The focus is on the distillation of themes that have become visible since the engagement of the struggle to define a post-behavioral science era for educational leadership. Two sources of data inform the discussion. First, we completed a general review of the literature in the area of school administration over the last 15 years. Second, we analyzed responses to three surveys completed by colleagues in school administration--one by 44 chairs from leadership department in UCEA institutions, one by 19 senior scholars in educational administration who allocate some of their research agenda to the study of the profession, and one by 86 colleagues whose understandings of reform in educational administration grow primarily from the changes they experience as members of the profession, not from their scholarship (for more details, see Murphy & Forsyth, 1999, chapters 2 and 7). In analyzing both the literature and the surveys, the search was for highly visible patterns in the tapestry of school administration. We examine those patterns in condensed form in two subsections that parallel the analysis of the profession provided in Section II above: rebuilding the foundations of the profession and changes in preparation programs. As is generally the case with these broad reviews, considerable wisdom can be gleaned by attending to what is not well-illuminated by the analysis.

Rebuilding the Foundations

The Scaffolding

Macro-level configurations. To begin with, there is a sense in the literature and in the answers of the survey respondents that considerable effort is being devoted to assembling the elements necessary for rebuilding the profession--the creation of blueprints, the stockpiling of construction tools and material, and the organization of the labor necessary to undertake the work. While it is clear that various sectors of the field are employing different, and often incompatible, designs, there is a palpable sense of reform energy in the profession writ large and there is a discernable emphasis in leadership departments on strengthening preparation programs. Some of the forces engaged here include: (1) the ongoing efforts to refurbish--if not demolish--the old structure, especially the continued critique of the status quo as well as the many reconstruction initiatives underway; (2) the presence of highly visible reform agents, especially the task forces, commissions, and policy boards that have been active over the last 15 years; (3) the active pursuit of reform by key agencies in the profession, especially NCATE, CCSSO, NPBEA, and UCEA; and (4) the dissemination of demonstration initiatives, such as those sponsored by the Danforth Foundation, to strengthen the preparation of principals and the robustness of departments of educational leadership.

The rebalancing of preparation programs is also a featured issue in macro-level analysis of the profession. Two dimensions of the issue are especially prominent. To begin with, there is the pattern that one survey respondent labeled the "de-eliting" of preparation programs. In the words of our respondents, this means that there is no longer "a group of

'elite' institutions carrying the field": "The decline and now death of the University of Chicago's once famous Midwest Administration Center; the closing of graduate programs at Yale, Johns Hopkins, and elsewhere--all signal a gradual decline in the prestigious universities and their Education Administration programs and the rise of the lesser-known, lower prestige, smaller colleges."

One also develops a sense in these data of an increase in competition between suppliers of educational administration courses. There is a feeling that more institutions with less well-staffed faculties were moving into the preparation business. Noted with concern among survey respondents were "the proliferation of vendors for quick, easy, pain-free administrator certification" and the expansion of executive-style programs with minimal residency requirements. Contrary to economic theory, there appears to be a widespread feeling that this "competition" is lowering standards across educational administration programs in general and in the traditional quality institutions in particular.

Other new elements are also shaping the rebuilding of school administration, although none can be characterized as a theme. Among the most important are: an increase in the amount of networking efforts across institutions and throughout the profession; the internationalization of the profession; the reemergence of UCEA as a force and the strengthening of ties between UCEA and AERA; and the homogenization of programs across different types of institutions. With the exception of this last issue--increasing homogeneity--which has been confirmed by McCarthy and Kuh (1997), each of these issues merits further attention.

Micro-level configurations. At the micro level, the feminization of the field is perhaps the most dominant pattern in the still forming, post-behavioral-science portrait of school administration. This trend, in turn, is defined by at least three related elements: (1) a significant increase in the number of women in the professoriate, including the rise of women to positions of influence in professional organizations such as AERA, UCEA, and NCPEA; (2) a dramatic influx of women into certification and doctoral programs; and (3) an expanding presence of feminist perspectives in departments of school administration and in preparation programs for school leaders--what one survey respondent labeled "the infusion of the feminist perspective, feminist concerns, and feminist views of leadership, organization, and the role of education into educational leadership departments."

A second well-developed theme centers on the topic of departmental reconfiguration. A number of survey respondents made the point that departments of school administration are being reorganized in many colleges--a finding reinforced by the literature in this area (McCarthy & Kuh, 1997). Specifically, they are being merged with other programs to form larger departments or united with other departments to form larger divisions. Some colleagues maintained that these mergers have influenced programs negatively--resulting in fewer faculty trained in educational leadership and in less focus on issues of school administration. On the other hand, the fact that mergers sometimes strengthen relationships between departments of educational administration and departments of curriculum was viewed favorably.

An additional thread of the storyline here was characterized by one faculty respondent as "the doctoralization of education"--a heightened focus on the awarding of doctoral degrees

in response to the need for leaders to secure this professional credential to gain employment in more and more jobs. Other individuals described changes in residency requirements, emphasizing primarily the growth of alternatives to full-time, on-campus residences. Finally, there is some evidence across all our sources of data that the basic structure of preparation programs is being reshaped by the rapid expansion of cohort programs. (We say more about these issues below.)

Infrastructure

There is moderate support for the claim that the foundations of educational administration, if not actually being repoured, have been undergoing important changes over the last decade. Particularly noteworthy have been the efforts to reshape the definition of school administration as a profession and to redefine educational administration as an area of study. On the first issue, there is some agreement that the conception of the school administrator role is being reconstructed around central ideas of leadership (Beck & Murphy, 1993). At the most basic level, this has meant a movement away from a century-long preoccupation with management ideology and with the dominant metaphor of principal as manager.

Leadership is being recast with materials from the intellectual and moral domains of the profession. A key element of this emerging vision is a deeper understanding of the centrality of learning and teaching and school improvement within the role of the school administrator--"a shift in focus [in the words of one survey respondent] from educational administration as management to educational administration primarily concerned with teaching and learning." Although other qualities of this new school administrator are less

clear, the literature does provide clues about what they might be: (a) an understanding of caring and humanistic concerns as a key to effective leadership, (b) knowledge of the transformational and change dynamics of the principalship, (c) an appreciation of the collegial and collaborative foundations of school administration, and (d) an emphasis on the ethical and reflective dimensions of leadership (see Murphy, 1999, and Murphy & Louis, 1994).

In much the same way that the literature is beginning to sketch out a redefined role for school leaders, it also reveals shifts underway in the prevailing conceptions of educational administration as a field of study. Three issues dominate the landscape here: (1) the search for a post-theory-movement knowledge base, (2) the emergence of alternative methods of investigation, and (3) a rebalancing of the academic-practitioner scale. On the first issue, survey respondents and the bulk of the literature echo what reviewers have been arguing for over a decade--that the infrastructure supporting the knowledge base for the last 40 years has weakened considerably, that we have been witnessing the loss of the intellectual core of our profession (see Section II above). While it is inaccurate to suggest that there is an emerging consensus about the defining elements of a developing knowledge base, the data we examined suggests that it will be more critical and more general in nature than it has been in the past. There is some sense that a post-theory-movement knowledge base will feature educational issues, ethics and values, and social conditions of children and their families and communities.

Concomitantly, there is consistency in the evidence that new forms of research have been privileged during the last 15 years. In particular, it is clear that ethnographic and other

qualitative methods have gained considerable legitimacy. The heterogeneity of methodology that Boyan (1981) noted in his review has increased.

A final theme in this area is the movement toward better integration of--or the development of more powerful linkages between--theory and practice. The struggle itself is defined by work that: (a) places more emphasis on constructing the knowledge base from the raw material of practice, (b) highlights "theory in action/practice" in research and preparation programs, (c) recognizes practitioners as legitimate contributors to the development of knowledge, and (d) legitimizes discourse about practice in educational leadership departments. The theme itself might best be described as the strengthening in some cases and the rebuilding in others of university connections with the field--linkages that have grown threadbare over the last fifty years. It represents new efforts to link the academic and practice arms of the profession through partnerships. As noted below, it also reflects the significance of field-based experiences for students and the importance of practice-based problems for shaping learning activities in classes. Part of the storyline is an underlying sense of greater willingness to acknowledge the applied nature of the profession and to share the spotlight with practitioner colleagues--a movement to what Clark (1997) calls "authentic educational leadership" (p. 1).

Changes in Preparation Programs

> After being directionless for a decade, the field of educational administration in the mid-1980s undertook some important efforts to improve school leadership and the preparation of school leaders. (McCarthy & Kuh, 1997, p. 12)

Based on the replies of our survey respondents and a rather comprehensive review of work over the last 15 years, it appears that the pressures for reform are having a noticeable influence on administrator preparation programs.

Recruitment

To begin with, there is evidence of more active recruitment of students than has historically been the case in the profession. One gets a sense that the calls for greater emphasis on student recruitment that pepper major reform reports (e.g., NCEEA, 1987; NPBEA,1989) and ribbon critiques of the field (Griffiths, 1988; Murphy, 1990c) are being heeded. Some of this enhanced attention can be traced to concerted efforts to secure more diverse student bodies, especially in terms of racial composition. Some of the change is attributable to the widespread implementation of cohort programs, a dynamic that seems to have both permitted and encouraged programs to be more thoughtful about recruiting students. More vigorous work in the recruitment vineyards can also be linked to the establishment of collaborative arrangements with colleagues in schools and school districts to identify quality candidates. These partnerships are both a motivating force in and an outcome of the quest to strengthen recruitment in educational leadership programs.

Finally, while harder to pin down, part of a new proactive stance in the area of student recruitment results from enhanced clarity about program goals and conceptions of leadership undergirding individual preparation programs. There is some evidence that departments of school administration are arriving at more coherent and more shared understandings of leadership as well as more robust knowledge about experiences necessary to nurture leadership among students. As they do so, the picture of the type of student who

fits that vision becomes clearer. In turn, some programs are being more aggressive in seeking out these types of students rather than simply waiting for the traditional drop-in trade. It is important to emphasize that these visions of good leadership and portraits of appropriate students vary across programs. For example, some programs seek out students with demonstrated leadership experience in schools while others deliberately cast a wider net, looking for non-traditional, and in some cases maverick, candidates. The key ingredient seems to be the clarity of perspective in the department. It is this dimension that seems to encourage active recruitment.

In closing, it is noteworthy that although still not heavily emphasized, recruitment is being connected to funding issues in ways not on the radar screen in earlier analyses (Murphy, 1991). A number of programs have entered into collaborative arrangements with school districts that help defray the costs of schooling for students.

Selection

In the area of selection, there is evidence of strengthened standards and greater selectivity. In some places, traditional selection measures such as grade point average and Graduate Record Examination scores have been ratcheted up. More important, a theme that might best be thought of as a revitalization of existing selection measures and a broadening of the portfolio of selection tools is evident. In this regard, there appears to be movement on a number of fronts at the same time. On one front, there seems to be greater coherence about the relevant mix of measures to be employed in the selection process as well as renewed commitment to employ these tools in a thoughtful fashion in the service of collecting and assessing information about candidates. There is a sense of a shift in the use of

screening tools as rituals to fill slots to the use of screening tools as part of more wholistic and vibrant systems of measures for securing more able students.

At the same time, the key issue, as with recruitment, seems to be a more thoughtful use of a variety of measures deemed appropriate at a given institution rather than the identification of a particular list of indices. In some cases, assessment center exercises are being employed. In other departments, more traditional measures are being used. The essential ingredient appears to be commitment by the faculty to a comprehensive set of measures that are consistent with the demands and expectations of their various programs.

One major theme defines the pattern of students served by school administration programs--they are more diverse than a decade before. This is most noticeable in the increased percentages of minorities and women in leadership programs.

Course Content

Analysts of the condition of the curriculum that defined preparation programs in the 1970s and 1980s are generally quite critical (see Murphy, 1992, for a review). Neither do reviewers discern much interest during that period on the part of faculty to engage systemic curricular revision (McCarthy et al., 1988). By 1999, however, program change and development has become an important thread in the fabric of school administration. Indeed, the curriculum in preparation programs has been evolving in discernable ways over the last decade. Most noticeably, there has been an increase in attention provided to the core technology of schooling--tighter linkages between leadership and learning or what one survey respondent characterized as a "refocus on student learning and curriculum as major

content/skill areas for administrators." The notion of the school administrator as instructional leader appears to be taking hold across the landscape of the profession. The overall feeling one senses is that program curriculum is being configured to support instructional improvement. At the macro level, this has meant more consideration being devoted to unpacking and examining the purposes of education and the appropriate missions for schools. It has also led to the pursuit of deeper understandings of and commitment to school reform, educational change, and school improvement. At the micro level, throwing the spotlight on the core technology has underscored the importance of theories of learning and teaching in preparation programs and has promoted increased legitimacy for examining quality teaching. It has also enhanced the saliency of student outcomes in assessing organizational effectiveness.

Over the last decade, preparation programs also seem to be awakening to the need to attend more forcefully to the moral and ethical dimensions of schooling and to the political aspects of education. In the ethics area, the moral context of leadership and the moral dimensions of the administrator's role are receiving more attention. There also seems to be a growing recognition of the ethic of caring and the importance of values in schools. In the policy domain, there is a sense that the curriculum in preparation programs has been evolving to reflect what one survey respondent labeled the "ecology of organizations"; that is, the use of policy not as a managerial tool but as a vehicle for leaders to guide organizations with increasingly permeable boundaries.

There is also some evidence of increased attention to the social fabric of education in program curriculum. While this concept covers a good deal of ground, it unpacks into at

least three clusters of ideas, all of which are anchored in what one respondent labeled "the human factors in school leadership." To begin with, expanded emphasis on the social aspects of education has meant more attention devoted to the relationships between school and community--to new attention on education as an aspect of the larger society and to preparing leaders to operate from this perspective. The social dimension of the curriculum also includes greater attention to issues of diversity and to its impact on schooling and school leaders. Diversity, in turn, is generally defined primarily in terms of race, income, gender, other cultures, and internationalization. There is also some suggestion that more consideration is being given to collaborative organizational processes in preparation programs today than was the case a decade ago. Learning experiences designed to help future school leaders understand the importance of empowerment and to develop skills in the exercise of shared decision making/leadership are central topics in this area. Related ideas include nurturing teacher professionalism, learning to lead from the center rather than the apex of the organization, and developing schools as learning communities and collaborative cultures.

Other curricular changes also dot the preparation landscape, but with less frequency than the attention devoted to the educational, moral, and social dimensions of leadership programs. Three concepts define this second-tier grouping of curriculum revisions: (1) the continuing trend to emphasize qualitative research methods in research courses and in assignments completed in other classes; (2) a focus on technology in coursework, primarily as a tool for better organizational management (i.e., technology applied to administration); and (3) renewed attention to curriculum grounded in "successful corporate practice" and "business management tools and techniques."

Clinical Experiences

A good deal of change seems to be unfolding in the clinical components of preparation programs as well. Two patterns emerge. First, the focus on clinically based experiences in these programs has increased; there has been a significant increase in the role of field work in administrator preparation. This enhancement can best be characterized as the strengthening of the full array of clinical components, from class-based activities to full-blown internships. The profession seems to be working to integrate clinical experiences into university-based courses in new ways, i.e., clinical experiences are becoming a more significant component of regular courses. The use of real-world problems in coursework also appears to be expanding. The firewall between field activities and university coursework is being dismantled in many programs. At the same time, it appears that traditional practicum activities are being fortified. More time is being devoted to the practicum, and it is being done in a more thoughtful fashion. Finally, and consistent with recent NCATE guidelines, it is clear that the internship is being lengthened and deepened in many places. The overall effect is that the profession seems to be taking the clinical dimension of preparation programs more seriously than they did when the theory era of school administration was coming to an end in the early 1980s. Consequently, these clinical components comprise a larger percentage of the program completed by today's students.

The second theme can be characterized as an upgrading of the quality of the expanded clinical component of preparation programs. The plethora of methods being employed to improve field-based experiences includes: providing more structure to assignments, especially in terms of expectations about what students need to learn; increasing the amount

and the quality of faculty supervision; ensuring greater involvement of site supervisors; integrating field experiences and academic offerings more effectively; developing better forums for students to debrief on clinical experiences and to reflect on their learning; creating better systems of mentor advising; establishing more diverse, field-based learning opportunities; and monitoring clinical experiences more closely.

In summary, it seems that programs have seriously begun to address the well-documented weaknesses and nearly intractable problems that have plagued the clinical component of preparation programs for the last 30 years. A more aggressive integration of field-based activities into traditional university-based classes has been an especially noteworthy achievement in these programs over the last decade. The continuation of the earlier efforts of the late 1980s to extend and deepen clinical work and to upgrade the quality of field-based experiences also deserves to be acknowledged. The one area on which the data fail to provide much information is the nature of the clinical experiences themselves. We need better information at a micro level about the activities in which students in these longer and improved field experiences are actually engaged.

Teaching

While not gainsaying the continued prevalence of traditional "talk and chalk" methods, there is some evidence that instruction in school administration preparation programs is richer and more multi-dimensional in 1999 than it was when the original calls for strengthening preparation programs were released in the mid to late 1980s. Most noteworthy has been the infusing of more authentic material and more thoughtful and reflective methods into programs. Undergirding this shift has been an enhanced focus on

active learning and a renewed interest in the raw material of practice. Indeed, the major theme in this area chronicles the story of how instruction has become grounded more firmly in issues of practice. A variety of elements, in turn, help define practice-anchored instruction, including increased cooperation with schools in the delivery of programs of study, a renewed emphasis on the engagement of school-based administrators in the delivery of programs and services, and a general reknitting of the connections between universities and local educational agencies around issues of administrator training. Practice-anchored instruction also includes the use of more case-study inquiry and more problem-based learning strategies.

Structure

Evidence from the data we examined suggests that changes in preparation programs extend to the structures that house and support the learning activities and to the students engaged in these endeavors. Perhaps the most distinct piece of the structural mosaic has been the widespread implementation of cohort programs. At the same time, there appears to have been an increase in the number of alternative delivery structures, such as executive doctoral programs and distance learning models to deliver off campus programs. Some shifts in the composition of faculty are also becoming visible, including the presence of more women and more professors with school- and district-based experience in departments of school administration.

Summary

While it is difficult to locate the influences afoot with certainty, some or all of the forces discussed below may help explain the program changes just examined. On the one

hand, time may be the salient variable (Murphy, 1991). That is, most of the reform reports in the area of leadership have had a chance to spread across the profession. There has also been sufficient time for programs to engage change initiatives and for some of those efforts to take root.

It may also be the case that the buffering these programs have historically enjoyed--buffering employed to fend off external influences--may be thinning considerably. In short, their option not to act may be being reduced. In particular, the resurgence of more vigorous state control over preparation programs may be propelling reform efforts. This has certainly been the case in the states of North Carolina, Ohio, Mississippi, and Kentucky (Van Meter, 1999). Concomitantly, the introduction of market dynamics into the licensure system may be influencing departments to strengthen their training programs. At least two such forces have surfaced over the last decade--the creation of alternative avenues for licensure and the growth of alternative providers of programs leading to licensure, especially those offered by professional associations and local educational agencies.

Professional forces may also lie behind the reform work noted by these department heads. The widespread complacency about preparation programs among professors of educational administration, which has been highlighted by McCarthy et al. (1988) and McCarthy and Kuh (1997), is perhaps being challenged as older members of the professoriate retire and new faculty begin to assume the reigns of the profession. If indeed we are witnessing a lifting of the veil of complacency, it may be attributable to the influx of more women professors and of more faculty members who are joining the professoriate from

practice (McCarthy, 1999). There certainly appears to be more agitation for program improvement today than was the case in the mid-1980s.

The growth of professional groups dedicated to program reform such as the new AERA special interest groups on problem-based learning and on teaching and learning in educational administration are noteworthy markers in the professional area. So too has been the development of professional networks of reformers such as those nurtured through the Danforth initiatives of the late 1980s and early 1990s. In short, it may be that the rather inhospitable landscape of the profession is being remolded to be more receptive to the seeds of change. It is worth noting that many more colleagues than was the case fifteen years ago have staked at least part of their professional reputations on work related to preparation program development and reform.

Finally, it is possible that shifting norms in universities in general and in colleges of education in particular may be responsible for some of the increased attention to program reform uncovered in our review. Specifically, at least two forces operating in education schools may be directing, or at least facilitating, program improvement. The first is the increased emphasis being placed "on enhancing the quality of instruction [in] most colleges and universities" (McCarthy & Kuh, 1997, p. 245). The second is the demand by many colleges of education that meaningful connections to practice be established and nurtured. While sometimes offset by other forces (e.g., the press for research respectability), these two dynamics may be helping to energize efforts to strengthen preparation programs in the area of educational leadership.

V. A Call for a New Center of Gravity

> If educational administration ever had a central core or intellectual cohesion, that era seems to be past. (Campbell et al., 1987, p. 199)
>
> There are . . . several freeways which run through the territory [of school administration] with only a few crossovers and intersections available. (Boyan, 1981, p. 8)

Let us take stock of where we are. We proposed that we are in the midst of considerable ferment in the field. We provided an overview of the forces that have driven and continue to fuel change efforts. We also offered a quick snapshot of some of the key markers in the struggle to move us to a different place--efforts to redefine, if not reanchor, the profession. Finally, we pointed to some themes that help us see what is unfolding in the field of school administration writ large.

The question at hand is, Where exactly are we? Are we still mired in the ferment, or are we closer to breaking out and establishing new foundations for the profession? There are, of course, quite different views on this issue. Perhaps the best answer is one provided by Robert Hutchins, although in reference to a different topic: "The system is headed in no direction, or in the wrong direction, or in all directions at once." This assumes that there is a "right" direction, a highly inflammable position in the university wing of the profession. Nonetheless, I will argue that there is a right direction, a principle of correspondence (Kliebard, 1995) that allows us both to honor the diversity of work ongoing in school administration and to maintain a center of gravity for the profession.

A Framework of Possibilities

> Since the early decades of this century, proponents of contrasting philosophical views have sought to shape the graduate experience. One view has placed administrative roles at the center of thought and teaching. . . . The other view has emphasized the centrality of ethical and intellectual qualities essential to leadership in the larger public domain and within schools and school systems themselves. (Campbell et al., 1987, p. 192)

Before we get there, however, I would like to lay out the traditional possibilities for creating a new center for school administration as a profession in general and for the preparation and development of school leaders in particular. While there are a variety of ways to think about this task, let me present a roadmap that encompasses the four most well-traveled pathways: Primacy of mental discipline (processes), primacy of the administrator (roles, functions, tasks), primacy of content (knowledge), and primacy of method.

A focus on mental discipline posits that particular content is less important than the development of processes or metacognitive skills. With deep roots in the dominant seventeenth and eighteenth centuries understandings of learning, a mental discipline perspective views content as a vehicle for the development of important faculties such as observation, judgement, and perception (Herbst, 1996; Krug, 1964; Reese, 1995). In here, one might include work on: (1) processes--such as the early work of Griffiths (1958) on administration as decision making or the more recent research of Leithwood (Leithwood & Stager, 1989) on administration as problem solving; (2) thinking/reflection--such as the scholarship of Ann Hart (1993), Chuck Kerchner (1993), and Karen Osterman and Robert

Kottkamp (1993); and, at least for our purposes here, (3) ethics and values--such as the writings of Jerry Starratt (1991) and Lynn Beck (1994). In the practice wing of the professional edifice, one need look no further than to the quite popular assessment centers of the National Association of Secondary School Principals and the National Association of Elementary School Principals to see the vitality of the mental discipline approach grounding the profession (see, for example, Sirotnik & Durden, 1996).

Highlighting the role of the administrator privileges issues relating to the activities of school leaders. A review of the literature reveals that the key constructs here are: (1) roles--such as the work of Arthur Blumberg (1985), Larry Cuban (1976), Susan Moore Johnson (1996), and Richard Wallace (1996) on the superintendency; Hartzell, Williams, and Nelson (1995) and Catherine Marshall (1992) on the assistant principalship; Terry Deal and Kent Peterson (1990), Ellen Goldring and Sharon Rallis (1993), Phil Hallinger and Charlie Hausman (1994), Ann Hart and Paul Bredeson (1996), Karen Seashore Louis (Louis & Miles, 1990), Nona Prestine (1994), Tom Sergiovanni (1987), and a host of others on the principalship; (2) functions--such as the work of Martha McCarthy, Nona Cambron-McCabe, and S. B. Thomas (1998) on law, Jim Guthrie (Garms, Guthrie, & Pierce, 1978) and David Monk and Marge Plecki (1999) on finance, and Phil Young (Young, Place, Rinehart, Jury, & Baits, 1997) and William Castetter (1986) in the personnel area; and (3) tasks--such as the writings of Daresh (1989) and Sergiovanni and Starratt (1988) on supervising employees.

Spotlighting content places knowledge at the center of the administrative stage. Historically, this approach features two epistemological axes--discipline-based (or technical) knowledge and practice-based knowledge--axes which are regularly portrayed as being under

considerable tension (Donmoyer, 1999; Forsyth & Murphy, 1999). Reform efforts afoot in the current era of ferment tend to spotlight the knowledge sector of our four-part framework. Work in the technical or academic domain is of three types: (1) struggles over the meaning and viability of knowledge-based foundations for the profession (see Donmoyer, Imber, & Scheurich, 1995); (2) attempts to widen the traditional knowledge domains that define school administration, e.g., the infusion of ethics and values into the profession (Beck & Murphy, 1994; Beck et al., 1998); and (3) analyses and initiatives to either recast the knowledge base of the field for the dialectic era (e.g., the recent NPBEA and UCEA curriculum development work described earlier) or establish a new ground for the profession (e.g., policy analysis--see Boyan, 1981, for a description of efforts to establish the politics of education as a foundation for the profession). In the practice domain, one main thrust has been the religitimization of the craft aspects of the profession, including the recognition of ideas such as "stories" that came under heavy critique during the scientific era (Griffiths, 1988b). A second thrust has been the work of scholars like Paula Silver (1986, 1987) and Ed Bridges and Phil Hallinger (1992, 1993, 1995) to codify and make more systematic what has traditionally been available in only an ad hoc fashion.

Finally, the field of school administration can be conceptualized in terms of methods. As with the other three areas, methods can be viewed as a strategy for helping move the profession from the current era of ferment to the next stage of development (Boyan, 1981). As with the case of emphasis on mental discipline, privileging methods pulls processes into the foreground while often, but not always, pushing other issues into the background. One line of work in this area has focused on efforts to strengthen methods in educational

administration research (see Boyan, 1981, for an analysis). In addition, as noted in Section IV above, much of the work in school administration in this domain has been in the service of developing a more robust portfolio of designs--in both the research and the application domains. On the issue of a more robust portfolio of research strategies, the works of qualitative methodologists such as Yvonna Lincoln (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) and of scholars employing non-traditional approaches (see Griffiths, 1991) are most noteworthy. In the application domain, the scholarship of Bridges and Hallinger (1992, 1993, 1995) on problem-based learning is becoming increasingly woven into the profession, as are a renewed emphasis on case studies and a bundle of instructional strategies such as journal writing, novels, films, reflective essays, and autobiographies (see, for example, Brieschke, 1990; English & Steffy, 1997; and Short & Rinehart, 1993).

The Need to Recast the Problem

> The problem [is] not choosing between existing alternatives as it [is] reconstructing the question as to present new ones. (Kliebard, 1995, p. 49)

A Single Break-Out Point

The central dilemma that we face is that none of the four avenues for regrounding the profession is likely to be successful, successful in the ability to take and hold the high ground for long. The ascendancy of any approach will by necessity be the result of power dynamics that legitimize a chain reaction of continual struggle, dominance, and fall from grace. Let me show how this is the case by examining how the most popular break-out strategy--the development of a more robust body of scholarship--is unlikely to carry us to the next phase

of development. Similar cases can be made for the other three elements of the framework as well.

The central problem is that our fascination with building the academic infrastructure of school administration has produced some serious distortions in what is primarily an applied field. It is difficult to see how renewed vigor in this area will do much to extract us from these difficulties. As a matter of fact, a case can be made that such efforts may simply exacerbate existing problems and deepen the fissures that mark the profession. To begin with, since academic knowledge is largely the purview of professors, the focus on technical knowledge places the university in the center of the field--a sort of pre-Copernican world view of the profession. This perspective also creates serious reference misalignment. It strongly suggests that the primary reference group for academics is other professors.

There are other reasons to believe that a primary focus on content, especially technical knowledge, is as likely to reenforce problems as it is to expose the foundations for a new era in school administration. On the one hand, if one believes that the best predictor of future behavior is past behavior, then a content-based attack on the problems of ferment and fragmentation will probably solidify the orientation of professors to the various academic disciplines rather than to the field of school administration with its problems and challenges. The quest for deeper and more robust knowledge becomes little more than academic trophy hunting. Under this scenario, new content, no matter how appealing the topics, is no more likely to improve the profession than did the content being replaced. I believe that there is evidence of this dynamic already in the more appropriate knowledge areas being mined today

(e.g., ethics, social context, critical theory, and so forth) (see, for example, Willower, 1998, on postmodernism).

Keeping the spotlight focused on academic knowledge also leads to, or at least reinforces, the belief that better theories will be the savior of educational practice. That is, if we can just develop better theories, the educational world would be a better place, educational administration programs would be stronger, and graduates would be more effective leaders. This entire argument is a little like the case for cold fusion. The problem is that the development of better or more refined or more elegant theories in and of itself will have almost no impact on the practice of school administration. Such work has not had much impact in the past, it is not having much influence now, and it is unlikely to be more efficacious in the future (Bridges, 1982; Hills, 1975). Worse, this work often reinforces the centrality of the university, makes knowledge an end rather than a means for improvement, privileges knowledge over values, and, quite frankly, diverts energy from other much more needed work.

All of this has led us to spend considerable time constructing what can only be labeled charitably as "the bridge to nowhere." That is, having made academic knowledge the coin of the realm and seeing its inability to penetrate the world of schooling, we have been forced to develop strategies to try to transport knowledge from the academic to the practice community. The focus is on the development of knowledge in one place and the transfer of it to another. I think that if we have learned anything over the last 30 years, it is that this bridge metaphor is largely inappropriate. When one examines this issue in a clear light, one really does not see much interest in actually doing the work necessary to build this bridge.

People on both sides of the river seem to be fairly content where they are. What's more, if through some type of magic, the bridge were ever constructed, I do not think it would end up carrying much traffic. Trying to link theory and practice has been for the last 30 years a little like attempting to start a car with a dead battery. The odds are fairly long that the engine will ever turn over.

A related case can also be developed against making practice-based knowledge the gold standard for reform. The central problem here is that the practice of educational leadership has very little to do with either education or leadership. Thus weaving together threads from practice to form a post-theory tapestry of school administration is a very questionable idea. A number of analysts have concluded that schools are organized and managed as if we had no knowledge of either student learning (Goodlad, 1984) or the needs of professional adults (Clark & Meloy, 1989; Weick & McDaniel, 1989). Others have discovered that schools are administered in ways such that educational goals are undermined and learning is hindered (McNeil, 1988; Sizer, 1984; Wise, 1989), especially for lower ability students (Cuban, 1989; Murphy & Hallinger, 1989). Still others have built a fairly strong case over the last 70 years that the profession has drawn energy almost exclusively from the taproot of management and the ideology of corporate America (Newlon, 1934; Callahan, 1962; Boyan, 1963; Murphy, 1992). The message, to perhaps state the obvious, is that this practice knowledge is not exactly the raw material with which to build a future for the profession.

The point in this section is not to dismiss knowledge as unimportant. Scientific inquiry, scholarly insights, and craft knowledge will offer useful substance in the process of

forging a post-scientific era of school administration. As a matter of fact, we will not be able to create a future without these critical components. What we are suggesting, however, is that if we expect a concerted effort primarily on this front to provide sufficient material to construct a new profession, we will likely be disappointed. Worse, over-reliance on the cultivation of knowledge, either in the academic or practice vineyards, is likely to exacerbate deeply rooted problems in the profession. And what is true for a singular focus on content holds, we argue, for methods, processes, and administrator roles and functions.

A Collective Attack

If none of the four traditional ways we have thought about the profession looks promising as a vehicle to help us escape what Campbell and his colleagues (1987) refer to as a non-tranquil scene in school administration, will not continued progress on all fronts guide us to a successful landing in a post-behavioral science era? It is possible, but I think not likely. The issue of dominance never really fades away, although it is possible to reenvision the evolution of productive tension among ideas that in turn fosters cycles of creative dialogue and action. While this is possible, the history of the field would, I think, encourage us to not be too sanguine about this collective strategy. There is little room to expect anything similar to unified action to result from this approach. Absent that, it seems more likely that we will have continued fragmentation (Boyd & Crowson, 1981; Immegart, 1977) and the absence of synergy necessary for the profession to progress to the next stage of development.

In addition, the more recent evidence on this strategy--what Donmoyer (1999) in his chapter in the just released Handbook of Research on Educational Administration calls the

"big tent" (p. 30) philosophy and what Campbell and his colleagues (1987) characterize as "paradigm enlargement" (p. 209)--is not encouraging either. After 15 years or more of following this approach, school administration today looks a good deal like Weick's (1976) famous tilted soccer field or, perhaps even more aptly, like the typical American high school of the last half of the twentieth century, what Powell, Farrar, and Cohen (1985) labeled the "shopping malls." We have responded to the challenges of purpose and development largely by ignoring them, at least by failing to thoughtfully grapple with them. We have done exactly what high schools have done; we have created a plethora of specialty shops for everyone who wants to move into the big tent. And like the players and fans in Weicks' soccer game, we have allowed everyone to establish their own rules and their own definitions of success. Everyone has his or her own booth in the tent and goes about his or her business with very few tethers to anything like a core, with little concern for coherence, largely unencumbered by mutually forged benchmarks and standards, with considerable thoughtfulness--or at least politeness--and with very little real conflict. Autonomy and civility rule. School administration as a profession stagnates.

Doing Nothing

Here is the question which now surfaces. If traditional frameworks that define the field offer insufficient force--either on a strategy-by-strategy or on a collective basis--then to redefine the profession, where do we turn? Before moving on to Dewey and Kliebard and the principle of correspondence, let me review a third possibility that is seen increasingly in the literature. In short, it would be to dismiss the notion that an anchor for the profession is a worthwhile idea. Certainly the discussion of a center or a core for school administration

will cause consternation if not alarm among some colleagues, especially to the extent that it highlights what Foster (1998) labels "the certainties that surround our field: our beliefs in instructional leadership . . . [and] in productivity as a goal" (p. 295). The very concept of a core carries the potential to privilege certain ideas while marginalizing others. Let me acknowledge at the outset that this is a quite legitimate concern and one that we had to struggle to address in developing the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Standards for School Leaders. Yet the concern is not sufficient, at least from where I sit, to negate action. I agree with Donmoyer (1999) and Evers and Lakomski (1996b) that this third avenue of response--rejection of the possibility of a center--is likely to lead to, to borrow a phrase from Evers and Lakomski (1996a), "skepticism and enfeebling relativism" (p. 342).

I would suggest that recognizing that all knowledge and action are political does not mean that all knowledge and action are equal. I believe that Willower (1998) provides the high ground here when he reminds us that "some constructions of reality are better than others" (p. 450). I would go further and suggest that in the world of ideas, diversity is not in and of itself a virtue. More important, I would encourage us to be skeptical of the viewpoint that a core will only advantage some ideas and marginalize others. Centers can empower as well as constrain. We hear too little of this dimension of coherence in our literature.

A Principle of Correspondence

> During a period of extraordinary environmental turbulence, a concern for practical relevance shows itself both in the press for a paradigm shift and at the core of an emerging synthesis. (Boyan, 1981, p. 11)

Viewing the Concept

So far, we have argued that doing nothing--giving up or resisting the search for a unifying center to the profession--is not a wise idea, nor is it necessary to protect the interests of scholars with diverse viewpoints. We have also suggested that a concerted effort to move to a new era for school administration by focusing on any given element of the professional framework, i.e., the production of new theoretical knowledge, will not likely serve us well either. Finally, we maintained that an eclectic or big tent strategy in this era of ferment is equally as likely to be ribboned with problems as to be marked with benefits. What is left? It seems to me that one answer--and the one I will advocate here--lies in the work of Herbert Kliebard (1995) in the area of curriculum. Building on the work of Dewey, Kliebard introduces a patched-together concept called "principle of correspondence" (p. 57). It is his way of describing Dewey's efforts to recast problems away from selecting among alternatives and toward "the critical problem of finding a principle" (p. 57) that provides correspondence between the valued dimensions of a profession. For us, it provides a way of recasting a dilemma that by definition is not solvable (Cuban, 1990, 1992) into a problem that is, or at least may be, solvable.[3] In effect, it provides a fifth way of defining the profession--a "synthesizing paradigm" (Boyan, 1981, p. 10) that focuses on defining aims rather than stirring the academic caldron or parsing out administrative activities, one that spotlights what Boyd (1983) refers to as "goal-directed management" (p. 4).

Developing Standards

How can we frame a principle of correspondence to meet our needs? There is a good deal of open space here. However, it probably is desirable to hold any principle of correspondence to the following seven standards:

- It should acknowledge and respect the diversity of work afoot in educational administration yet exercise sufficient magnetic force--or what Boyan (1981) refers to as "intellectual magnetism" (p. 12)--to pull much of that work in certain directions.
- It should be informed by and help organize the labor and the ideas from the current era of ferment.
- It should promote the development of a body of ideas and concepts that define school administration as an applied field.
- It should provide hope for fusing the enduring dualisms described by Campbell and his colleagues (1987) that have bedeviled the profession for so long (e.g., knowledge vs. values, academic knowledge vs. practice knowledge) and should, to quote from Evers and Lakomski (1996a), provide a "powerful touchstone for adjudicating rival approaches to administrative research" (p. 343).
- It should provide a crucible where civility among shop merchants in the big tent gives way to productive dialogue and exchange--to something akin to the conceptions of community so beautifully captured by Furman (1998) and by Beck and Foster (1999).

- It should be clear about the outcomes upon which to forge a redefined profession of school administration; in other words it should provide the vehicle for linking the profession to valued outcomes.

That is:

- It should establish a framework that ensures that the "standard for what is taught lies not with bodies of subject matter" (Kliebard, 1995, p. 72) but with valued ends.

School Improvement as a Model

School management and the preparation of school administrators need to be vigorously redirected toward the enhancement of the outcomes of schooling for children. (Boyd, 1983, p. 4)

Where might we find such a principle of correspondence? A number of thoughtful colleagues have provided frameworks that offer the potential to meet Kliebard's (1995) criterion of "reconstructing the questions as to present new [alternatives]" (p. 49) and that fit at least some of the standards outlined above. My purpose here is not to develop a comprehensive listing. Nor is it to evaluate each of the examples. The limited objective is simply to show how some colleagues in the profession have made progress in helping us exit the current era of turmoil by employing strategies that fit into the broad categorization of principles of correspondence.

A number of such efforts stand out. At least four with a knowledge-base tincture deserve mention. To begin with, there is the recent work of Griffiths (1995, 1997) on what he refers to as "theoretical pluralism" (1997, p. 371), but theoretical pluralism that is

intrinsically yoked to problems of practice. There is also the scholarship of Willower (1996) on naturalistic philosophy or naturalistic pragmatism. A related line of work which might be best labeled "pragmatism" has been developed by Hoy (1996). The scholarship of Evers and Lakomski (1996b) on "developing a systematic new science of administration" (p. 379)--what they describe as "naturalistic coherentism" (p. 385)--is a fourth example of a principle of correspondence at work. The most important example with a practice focus is the work of Bridges and Hallinger (1992, 1995) on problem-based learning. Ideas with feet in both the academic and practice camps have been provided by Donmoyer (1999) who introduces the concept of "utilitarianism" as a potential way to redefine debate and action in the profession and by Murphy (1992) who discusses a "dialectic" (p. 67) strategy.

Again, my purpose here is simply to reveal how colleagues have begun doing some of the heavy lifting to help us in the process of conceptualizing new ways to think about recentering school administration. Individually and collectively, they offer bundles of ideas and sets of elements--ideas such as a problem-solving focus, emphasis on the concrete, highlighting the sense of possibilities--that offer real promise to the profession.

At the same time, each of the approaches listed above falls short when measured against the standards for a principle of correspondence. In addition, with the possible exception of the latter two, each remains too closely associated with one or the other of the traditional ways in which we have framed the profession, in nearly every case a focus on knowledge production. If we take a step back, I think that we can build on these and other breakout ideas to move a little closer to our goal.

The question at hand is as follows: When we layer knowledge about the shortcomings of the profession (Section II) onto understandings developing in the current era of ferment (Sections III and IV) and then apply the notion of a principle of correspondence with its imbedded standards (Section V), what emerges? It seem to me that three powerful synthetic paradigms become visible: democratic community, social justice, and school improvement. Each of these offers the potential to capture many of the benefits revealed by the standards and, in the process, to borrow a phrase from Fullan, to reculture the profession of school administration. In the remainder of this paper, I focus on what it means to rebuild school administration on one of these principles--school improvement.

Before I do that, however, let me answer the question of why I picked door number three. To begin with, and in contrast to some of my colleagues (see for example Foster, 1998; Scheurich, 1995), I do not see major conflicts between these principles. As a matter of fact, I suspect that they can be nested without a great deal of discomfort. At the same time, for the field of school administration as an applied discipline, I believe that issues of community building and social reconstruction nest better within the principle of school improvement than vice versa. There is a danger in pushing any of these principles to the forefront. But, a review of the literature in our field leads me to conclude that school improvement has the intellectual magnetism to keep social justice in its orbit; whereas the opposite is open to question. In effect, democratic community and social justice complete our understanding of school improvement. The obverse may not hold. Second, I believe that school improvement as a principle of correspondence has a broader appeal, that is it is more accessible, to the practice and policy domains of the profession. It will be the most

effective of the three, I believe, in rebalancing the relationship between the academic and practice wings of the profession. Third, I believe that school improvement fits the standards for a principle of correspondence more fully than do the alternatives. Fourth, it addresses what Halpin (1957) described during the early phase of the theory movement as the most fundamental concern of the field--a focus on the foundations of school effectiveness--a call that was echoed by Boyan (1963) in the 1960s, expanded on in the 1970s by Erickson (1977, 1979), and clarified in the 1980s and 1990s by a number of colleagues in the educational leadership field. Finally, I find school improvement to be such a valuable synthetic design because it links with my own research-based understanding of school administration and educational leadership.

Consequences

A few points are worthy of note before we explore the implications of having school improvement and education form the new foundations of the profession. First, analysis of the last dominant era of the profession, the behavioral science phase, should lead us to be humble in our pronouncements. It was a fairly heady time for claims (Goldhammer, 1983; Murphy, 1992), and the outcomes fell considerably short of the expectations--or as Campbell and his colleagues (1987) have deduced, the behavioral science movement "produced more heat than light" (p. 193). Second, as noted in the introductory section of the paper, changing the taproot, for instance, changing from management to education, can have profound implications for educational administration. Yet it guarantees nothing. School improvement as a principle of correspondence offers considerable promise to educational administration. Yet whether we achieve that potential will remain an open question for some time.

The principle of correspondence we suggest argues for school improvement as the new center of gravity for school administration, education as the foundation for the profession, and applied knowledge as the fuel to make the system run (see Table 1).

Table 1
Rethinking the Center for the Profession of School Administration

Time Frame	Center of Gravity	Foundation	Engine
1820-1990 Ideology	Philosophy	Religion	Values
1901-1945 Prescription	Management	Administrative Functions	Practice Knowledge
1946-1985 Behavioral Science	Social Sciences	Academic Disciplines	Theoretical Knowledge
1986 → Dialectic	School Improvement	Education	Applied Knowledge

At the most fundamental level, this new center holds, as Evans (1991) nicely phrases it, that "the deep significance of the task of the school administrator is to be found in the pedagogical ground of its vocation" (p. 17). Thus, at the most basic level, the consequence of having a school improvement core, as Foster (1988) has argued, is that "educational administration must find its mission and purpose in the purpose of schooling generally" (p. 69), a point echoed by Sergiovanni (1993) and others. It means, as my colleague Phil Hallinger and I have argued over the years, that the profession of educational administration must be, first and foremost, educationally grounded. It honors what Iwanicki (in press) calls "learning-focused" leadership. An educational focus does much to allay fears raised by

colleagues like Guba (1960), Erickson (1977, 1979), Bates (1984), and others over the last 40 years and to reverse what Callahan (1962) labeled an "American tragedy" (p. 246).

Privileging school improvement also suggests that "understandings of administration and leading will need to change" (Prestine, 1995, p. 140). More specifically, it legitimates Bill Greenfield's (1995) proposition that "although numerous sources might be cultivated, norms rooted in the ethos and culture of teaching as a profession provide the most effective basis for leadership in a school" (p. 75). It infuses what Evans (1998) nicely describes as "the pedagogic motive" (p. 41) into the lifeblood of school leadership. In short, it forces us to rethink the meaning of leadership. It requires, as Rowan (1995) has recorded, that leaders be "pioneers in the development and management of new forms of instructional practice in schools, and [that] they . . . [develop] a thorough understanding of the rapidly evolving body of research on learning and teaching that motivate these new practices" (p. 116). Elsewhere, we, and others, have outlined what educationally grounded leadership entails (see Hallinger & Murphy, 1985, 1986; Murphy, Hallinger, Weil, & Mitman, 1983; Murphy 1990d, 1994). The important point here, as Leithwood, Leonard, and Sharatt (1998) recently concluded, is the educational ground. Labels such as instructional and transformational leadership are of secondary importance.

Reformulating the foundations of the profession to school improvement, education, and applied knowledge also implies a reconceptualization of the preparation and professional development functions in school administration. As the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (1996) concludes, the onus will be to "prepare and retrain principals who understand teaching and learning and who can lead high-performing schools" (p. 28).

Or as Evans (1998) postulates, with school improvement as the operational principle of correspondence, "we need to wonder how we can develop educators, especially principals, who can think educationally, and not just managerially, about life" (p. 46). For a variety of reasons, which we have described elsewhere (Murphy, Hallinger, Lotto, & Miller, 1987), this shift represent a daunting task for the profession of school administration in general and for university professors in particular.

Nonetheless, it is not difficult to tease out some of the alterations in how we conceptualize the education of school leaders that result from reanchoring the profession around school improvement. Three changes, in particular, stand out. To begin with, a greater proportion of time than has been the case traditionally (Murphy et al., 1987) will need to be devoted to issues of learning and teaching and to the principles of school improvement. The behavioral science era brought law, economics, sociology, anthropology, political science, and related disciplines to our preparation programs. With school improvement as the core, new sets of frameworks will occupy center stage. Learning theory, school change, curriculum theory, assessment, and data analysis strategies are areas that come readily to mind.

Second, and equally important, much of what currently unfolds in preparation programs will likely be redirected, i.e., linked to larger purposes and underlying values that characterize school improvement. Existing content will both draw meaning from and operate more explicitly in the service of school improvement. This is a good example of the channeling function of the core, which we described earlier in our treatment of standards for

principles of correspondence. It is perhaps most evident today in the areas of educational finance and in the policy domain of the profession.

In addition, a reformulation of school administration will influence the venue of learning activities in preparation programs. School improvement research--whether from the emerging body of research on professional development (Sparks & Hirsh, 1997), from the work on leadership as an organizational phenomena (Pounder, Ogawa, & Adams, 1995), from the growing understanding of professional communities (Louis & Kruse, 1996), from work on school change (Fullan, 1991), or from scholarship on whole-school reform (Stringfield, Ross, & Smith (1996)--helps us see that a good deal of the learning in preparation programs needs to be school-based.

Finally, it should be obvious that the research agenda of a regrounded profession will be pulled in some new directions. While fragmentation in the research domain is not a critical problem (Boyan, 1981), it does complicate the task of accumulating wisdom. It also makes it cumbersome to marshal concerted initiatives on the problems faced by practicing administrators and to address the needs of those in policy positions. While it is difficult to discern the full storyline here, some strands of the narrative are visible. First, a research agenda growing from the soil of school improvement has considerable potential to link micro-, mid-, and macro-level theory building. Second, it offers a useful avenue to provide "additional meaning" (Campbell et al., 1987, p. 207) to the various lines of work in the profession by linking them to school operations (Campbell et al., 1987). Third, a research agenda grounded in school improvement will direct energy toward the repair of two of the most critical flaws in the profession: the lack of attention to the core mission of our industry

(Boyan, 1963; Murphy, 1992) and our "tendency to neglect the careful tracing of connections between organizational variables and student outcomes" (Erickson, 1979, p. 12).

IV. Conclusion

It is perhaps best to close this manuscript the way we began, by reviewing the central theses and exposing the logic we pursued to illustrate them. We opened with the claim that for the past 15 years, we have been in an era of ferment in school administration. We revealed how this phase in our development has been marked with considerable energy and defined by numerous initiatives in all domains of the profession. Unfortunately, rather than helping us forge a consensus on the foundations of a post-behavioral science era for school administration, much of the work has led to the fragmentation of the profession on an array of dimensions.

For reasons outlined more fully above, we argued that the notion of a center or core for school administration is a good idea. We then described the array of strategies that have given meaning to the profession over time. We concluded that none of these approaches individually offer real promise of a breakout. We illustrated this proposition with reference to the most popular strategy currently in operation, i.e., attempts to redefine the profession through the development of a more theoretically sound knowledge base. We also concluded that a collective attack employing the full assortment of methods of understanding school administration will more likely lead to increased paradigm enlargement than to professional coherence.

In order to address the issue of a post-scientific era of school administration more productively, the concept of principles of correspondence was introduced. We based that

discussion on a set of standards that might allow us to weigh the value of various formulations of these principles. We also touched briefly on examples of scholarship that can be characterized as principle development work. From there, we developed the case for school improvement as an appropriate core for the profession of school administration in a post-scientific era. We closed by revealing how this regrounding strategy channels thinking about the profession writ large as well as ideology in school administration about leadership, leadership training, and research.

Notes

1. Sections 2 through 4 of this paper are drawn from Murphy and Forsyth (1999). For a more complete discussion of the issues raised there, see chapters 1, 2, and 7 of that volume.

2. Willower and Forsyth (1999), while acknowledging the diversity in the field, argue that "the unifying elements deserve greater attention than they have received" (p. 20).

3. This represents a shift from how I saw the resolution to the era of ferment in my earlier work (1992, 1993). In those pieces, I argued that a dialectic dynamic that fused conceptions of school administration dominating the landscape from 1990-1941 and from 1946-1985 would prevail and a new era of school administration would follow. While school improvement as a principle of correspondence is consistent with the outcome of the dialectic hypothesis, the process taken to get there is somewhat different.

References

Achilles, C. M. (1984, Fall). Forecast: Stormy weather ahead in educational administration. Issues in Education, 2(2), 127-135.

Achilles, C. M. (1994, February). Searching for the golden fleece: The epic struggle continues. Educational Administration Quarterly, 30(1), 6-26.

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (1988). School leadership preparation: A preface for action. Washington, DC: Author.

American Association of School Administrators. (1960). Professional administrators for America's schools (Thirty-eighth American Association of School Administrators Yearbook). Washington, DC: National Educational Administration.

Anderson, G. L. (1990, February). Toward a critical constructionist approach to school administration: Invisibility, legitimation, and the study of non-events. Educational Administration Quarterly, 26(1), 38-59.

Anderson, W. A., & Lonsdale, R. C. (1957). Learning administrative behavior. In R. F. Campbell & R. T. Gregg (Eds.), Administrative behavior in education (pp. 426-463). New York: Harper.

Bailey, R. W. (1987). Uses and misuses of privatization. In S. H. Hanke (Ed.), Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science: Vol. 36, No. 3. Prospects for privatization. (pp. 138-152). Montpelier, VT: Capital City Press.

Barber, B. R. (1984). Strong democracy: Participatory politics for a new age. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Barth, R. S. (1986). On sheep and goats and school reform. Phi Delta Kappan, 68(4), 293-296.

Bates, R. J. (1984). Toward a critical practice of educational administration. In T. J. Sergiovanni & J. E. Corbally (Eds.), Leadership and organizational culture: New perspectives on administrative theory and practice (pp. 260-274). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Bauman, P. C. (1996, November). Governing education in an antigovernment environment. Journal of School Leadership, 6(6), 625-643.

Beck, L. G. (1994). Reclaiming educational administration as a caring profession. New York: Teachers College Press.

Beck, L. G., & Foster, W. (1999). Administration and community: Considering challenges, exploring possibilities. In J. Murphy & K. S. Louis (Eds.), Handbook of research on educational administration (2nd ed., pp. 337-358). San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass.

Beck, L. G., & Murphy, J. (1993). Understanding the principalship: Metaphorical themes 1920s-1990s. New York: Teachers College Press.

Beck, L. G., & Murphy, J. (1994). Ethics in educational leadership programs: An expanding role. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Beck, L. G., Murphy, J., & Associates. (1998). Ethics in educational leadership preparation programs: Emerging models. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Beers, D., & Ellig, J. (1994). An economic view of the effectiveness of public and private schools. In S. Hakim, P. Seidenstat, & G. W. Bowman (Eds.), Privatizing education and educational choice: Concepts, plans, and experiences (pp. 19-38). Westport, CT: Praeger.

Björk, L. G., & Ginsberg, R. (1995, February). Principles of reform and reforming principal training: A theoretical perspective. Educational Administration Quarterly, 31(1), 11-37.

Blumberg, A., & Blumberg, P. (1985). The school superintendent: Living with conflict. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College.

Boyan, N. J. (1963). Common and specialized learnings for administrators and supervisors: Some problems and issues. In D. J. Leu & H. C. Rudman (Eds.), Preparation programs for school administrators: Common and specialized learnings (pp. 1-23). East Lansing: Michigan State University.

Boyan, N. J. (1981, February). Follow the leader: Commentary on research in educational administration. Educational Research, 10(2), 6-13, 21.

Boyan, N. J. (1988a). Describing and explaining administrator behavior. In N. J. Boyan (Ed.), Handbook of research on educational administration (pp. 77-97). New York: Longman.

Boyan, N. J. (Ed.). (1988b). Handbook of research on educational administration. New York: Longman.

Boyd, W. L. (1983, March). What school administrators do and don't do: Implications for effective schools. The Canadian Administrator, 22(6), 1-4.

Boyd, W. L., & Crowson, R. L. (1981). The changing conception and practice of public school administration. In D. C. Berliner (Ed.), Review of research in higher education (Vol. 9, pp. 311-373). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Brent, B. O. (1998, October). Should graduate training in educational administration be required for principal certification? Existing evidence suggests the answer is no. Teaching in Educational Administration, 5(2), 1, 3-4, 7-10.

Bridges, E. M. (1977). The nature of leadership. In L. L. Cunningham, W. G. Hack, & R. O. Nystrand (Eds.), Educational administration: The developing decades (pp. 202-230). Berkeley: McCutchan.

Bridges, E. M. (1982, Summer). Research on the school administrator: The state of the art. Educational Administration Quarterly, 18(3), 12-33.

Bridges, E. M., & Hallinger, P. (1992). Problem-based learning for administrators. Eugene: University of Oregon, ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.

Bridges, E. M., & Hallinger, P. (1993). Problem-based learning in medical and managerial education. In P. Hallinger, K. Leithwood, & J. Murphy (Eds.), Cognitive perspectives on educational leadership (pp. 253-267). New York: Teachers College Press.

Bridges, E. M. & Hallinger, P. (1995). Implementing problem-based learning in leadership development. Eugene: University of Oregon, ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.

Brieschke, P. A. (1990, November). The administration in fiction: Using the novel to teach educational administration. Educational Administration Quarterly, 26(4), 376-393.

Burke, C. (1992). Devolution of responsibility to Queensland schools: Clarifying the rhetoric critiquing the reality. Journal of Educational Administration, 30(4), 33-52.

Callahan, R. E. (1962). Education and the cult of efficiency. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Campbell, R. F., Fleming, T., Newell, L., & Bennion, J. W. (1987). A history of thought and practice in educational administration. New York: Teachers College Press.

Candoli, I. C. (1991). School system administration: A strategic plan for site-based management. Lancaster, PA: Technomic.

Castetter, W. B. (1986). The personnel function in educational administration (4th ed.). New York: Macmillan.

Chase, F. S. (1960). The administrator as implementor of the goals of education for our time. In R. F. Campbell & J. M. Lipham (Eds.), Administrative theory as a guide to action (pp. 191-201). Chicago: University of Chicago, Midwest Administration Center.

Cibulka, J. G. (1999). Ideological lenses for interpreting political and economic changes affecting schooling. In J. Murphy & K. S. Louis (Eds.), Handbook of research on educational administration (2nd ed., pp. 163-182). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Clark, D. L. (1988, June). Charge to the study group of the National Policy Board for Educational Administration. Unpublished paper.

Clark, D. L. (1997, March). Searching for authentic educational leadership in university graduate programs and with public school colleagues. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Clark, D. L., & Meloy, J. M. (1989). Renouncing bureaucracy: A democratic structure for leadership in schools: In T. J. Sergiovanni & J. A. Moore (Eds.), Schooling for tomorrow: Directing reform to issues that count (pp. 272-294). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Cohen, D. K. (1988, September). Teaching practice: Plus ca change . . . (Issue Paper 88-3). East Lansing: Michigan State University, National Center for Research on Teacher Education.

Consortium on Productivity in the Schools. (1995). Using what we have to get the schools we need. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College, The Institute on Education and the Economy.

Cooper, B. S., & Boyd, W. L. (1987). The evolution of training for school administrators. In J. Murphy & P. Hallinger (Eds.), Approaches to administrative training (pp. 3-27). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Cooper, B. S., & Muth, R. (1994). Internal and external barriers to change in departments of educational administration. In T. A. Mulkeen, N. H. Cambron-McCabe, & B. J. Anderson, (Eds.), Democratic leadership: The changing context of administrative preparation (pp. 61-81). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Cremin, L. A. (1961). The transformation of the school: Progressivism in American education 1876-1957. New York: Vintage.

Cronin, T. E. (1989). Direct democracy: The politics of initiative, referendum, and recall. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Crowson, R. L., & McPherson, R. B. (1987). The legacy of the theory movement: Learning from the new tradition. In J. Murphy & P. Hallinger (Eds.), Approaches to administrative training in education (pp. 45-64). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Cuban, L. (1976). Urban school of chiefs under fire. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cuban, L. (1989). The "at-risk" label and the problem of urban school reform. Phi Delta Kappan, 70(10), 780-84, 799.

Cuban, L. (1990, October). Reforming school administration: Theory and practice. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Pittsburgh, PA.

Cuban, L. (1992, January-February). Managing dilemmas while building professional communities. Educational Researcher, 21(1), 4-11.

Culbertson, J. A. (1963). Common and specialized content in the preparation of administrators. In D. J. Leu & H. C. Rudman (Eds.), Preparation programs for administrators: Common and specialized learnings (pp. 34-60). East Lansing: Michigan State University.

Culbertson, J. A. (1964). The preparation of administrators. In D. E. Griffiths (Ed.), Behavioral science in educational administration (Sixty-third National Society for the Study of Education Yearbook, Part II, pp. 303-330). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Culbertson, J. A. (1965). Trends and issues in the development of a science of administration. In Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, Perspectives on Educational Administration and the Behavioral Sciences (pp. 3-22). Eugene: University of Oregon, Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration.

Dahrendorf, R. (1995, Summer). A precarious balance: Economic opportunity, civil society, and political liberty. The Responsive Community, 13-39.

Daresh, J. C. (1989). Supervision as a proactive process. New York: Longman.

Deal, T. E., & Peterson, K. D. (1990). The principal's role in shaping school culture. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Donahue, J. D. (1989). The privatization decision: Public ends, private means. New York: Basic Books.

Donmoyer, R. (1999). The continuing quest for a knowledge base: 1976-1998. In J. Murphy & K. S. Louis (Eds.), Handbook of research on educational administration (2nd ed., pp. 25-43). San Fransicso: Jossey-Bass.

Donmoyer, R., Imber, M., & Scheurich, J. J. (Eds.). (1995). The knowledge base in educational administration: Multiple perspectives. Albany: The State University of New York Press.

Elmore, R. F. (1989, March). Models of restructured schools. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Elmore, R. F. (1993). School decentralization: Who gains? Who loses? In J. Hannaway & M. Carnoy (Eds.), Decentralization and school improvement (pp. 33-54). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Elshtain, J. B. (1995). Democracy on trial. New York: Basic Books.

English, F. W. (1997, January). The cupboard is bare: The postmodern critique of educational administration. Journal of School Leadership, 7(1), 4-26.

English, F. W., & Steffy, B. F. (1997, February). Using film to teach leadership in educational administration. Educational Administration Quarterly, 33(1), 107-115.

Erickson, D. A. (1977). An overdue paradigm shift in educational administration, or how can we get that idiot off the freeway. In L. L. Cunningham, W. G. Hack, & R. O. Nystrand (Eds.), Educational administration: The developing decades (pp. 114-143). Berkeley: McCutchan.

Erickson, D. A. (1979, March). Research on educational administration: The state-of-the-art. Educational Researcher, 8, 9-14.

Erlandson, D. A., & Witters-Churchill, L. (1988, March). Design of the Texas NASSP study. Paper presented at the annual convention of the National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Evans, R. (1991, April). Ministrative insight: Educational administration as pedagogic practice. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Evans, R. (1998, Summer). Do intentions matter? Questioning the text of a high school principal. Journal of Educational Administration and Foundations, 13(1), 30-51.

Evers, C. W., & Lakomski, G. (1996a, August). Postpositivist conceptions of science in educational administration: An introduction. Educational Administration Quarterly, 32(3), 341-343.

Evers, C. W., & Lakomski, G. (1996b, August). Science in educational administration: A postpositivist conception. Educational Administration Quarterly, 32(32), 379-402.

Farquhar, R. H. (1981, June). Preparing educational administrators for ethical practice. The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 27(2), 192-204.

Forsyth, P. (1999). A brief history of scholarship on educational administration. In J. Murphy & P. Forsyth (Eds.), Educational administration: A decade of reform (pp. -). Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Forsyth, P., & Murphy, J. (1999). A decade of changes: Emerging themes. In J. Murphy & P. Forsyth (Eds.), Educational administration: A decade of reform (pp.). Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Foster, W. (1988). Educational administration: A critical appraisal. In D. E. Griffiths, R. T. Stout, & P. B. Forsyth (Eds.), Leaders for America's schools: The report and papers of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (pp. 68-81). Berkeley: McCutchan.

Foster, W. (1998, August). Editor's foreword. Educational Administration Quarterly, 34(3), 294-297.

Fullan, M. (1991). The new meaning of educational change. New York: Teachers College Press.

Furman, G. C. (1998, August). Postmodernism and community in schools: Unraveling the paradox. Educational Administration Quarterly, 34(3), 298-328.

Garms, W. I., Guthrie, J. W., & Pierce, L. C. (1978). School finance: The economics and politics of public education. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Gerritz, W., Koppich, J., & Guthrie, J. (1984, November). Preparing California school leaders: An analysis of supply, demand, and training. Berkeley: University of California, Berkeley, Policy Analysis for California Education.

Goldhammer, K. (1983, Summer). Evolution in the profession. Educational Administration Quarterly, 19(3), 249-272.

Goldring, E. B., & Rallis, S. F. (1993). Principals of dynamic schools: Taking charge of change. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Goodlad, J. I. (1984). A place called school: Prospects for the future. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Gottfried, P. (1993). The conservative movement (Rev. ed.). New York: Twayne.

Graff, O. B., & Street, C. M. (1957). Developing a value framework for educational administration. In R. F. Campbell & R. T. Gregg (Eds.), Administrative behavior in education (pp. 120-152). New York: Harper.

Greenfield, T. B. (1975). Theory about organization: A new perspective and its implications for schools. In M. G. Hughes (Ed.), Administering education: International challenge (pp. 71-99). London: Athlone.

Greenfield, T. B. (1988). The decline and fall of science in educational administration. In D. E. Griffiths, R. T. Stout, & P. B. Forsyth (Eds.), Leaders for America's schools: The report and papers of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (pp. 131-159). Berkeley: McCutchan.

Greenfield, W. D. (1995, February). Toward a theory of school administration: The centrality of leadership. Educational Administration Quarterly, 31(1), 61-85.

Gregg, R. T. (1969). Preparation of administrators. In R. L. Ebel (Ed.), Encyclopedia of educational research (4th ed., pp. 993-1004). London: MacMillan.

Griffiths, D. E. (1958). Administration as decision-making. In A. W. Halpin (Ed.), Administrative theory in education. Chicago: University of Chicago, Midwest Administration Center.

Griffiths, D. E. (1988a). Administrative theory. In N. J. Boyan (Ed.), Handbook of research on educational administration (pp. 27-51). New York: Longman.

Griffiths, D. E. (1988b). Educational administration: Reform PDQ or RIP (Occasional paper, No. 8312). Tempe, AZ: University Council for Educational Administration.

Griffiths, D. E. (Ed.). (1991). Special issue: Non-traditional research methods in educational administration. Educational Administration quarterly, 27(3).

Griffiths, D. E. (1995). Theoretical pluralism in educational administration. In R. Donmoyer, M. Imber, & J. J. Scheurich (Eds.), The knowledge base in educational administration: Multiple perspectives (pp. 300-309). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Griffiths, D. E. (1997, October). The case for theoretical pluralism. Educational Management & Administration, 25(4), 371-380.

Griffiths, D. E. (1999). Preface. In J. Murphy & P. Forsyth (Eds.), Educational administration: A decade of reform (pp. -). Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Griffiths, D. E., Stout, R. T., & Forsyth, P. B. (Eds.) (1988a). Leaders for America's schools: The report and papers of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration. Berkeley: McCutchan.

Griffiths, D. E., Stout, R. T., & Forsyth, P. B. (1988b). The preparation of educational administrators. In D. E. Griffiths, R. T. Stout, & P. B. Forsyth (Eds.), Leaders for America's schools: The report and papers of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (pp. 284-304). Berkeley: McCutchan.

Guba, E. G. (1960). Research in internal administration--what do we know? In R. F. Campbell & J. M. Lipham (Eds.), Administrative theory as a guide to action (pp. 113-141). Chicago: University of Chicago, Midwest Administration Center.

Guthrie, J. W. (1986, December). School-based management: The next needed education reform. Phi Delta Kappan, 68(4), 305-309.

Guthrie, J. W. (1997, October). The paradox of educational power: How modern reform proposals miss the point. Education Week, 17(7), 34.

Hakim, S., Seidenstat, P., & Bowman, G. W. (1994). Introduction. In S. Hakim, P. Seidenstat, & G. W. Bowman (Eds.), Privatizing education and educational choice: Concepts, plans, and experiences (pp. 1-15). Westport, CT: Praeger.

Haller, E. J., Brent, B. O., & McNamara, J. H. (1997, November). Does graduate training in educational administration improve America's schools? Phi Delta Kappan, 79(3), 222-227.

Hallinger, P., & Hausman, C. (1994). From Attila the Hun to Mary Had a Little Lamb: Principal role ambiguity in restructured schools. In J. Murphy & K. S. Louis (Eds). Reshaping the principalship: Insights from transformational reform efforts (pp. 154-176). Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Hallinger, P., Leithwood, K., & Murphy, J. (Eds.). (1993). A cognitive perspective on educational administration. New York: Teachers College Press.

Hallinger, P., & Murphy J. (1985, November). Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals. Elementary School Journal, 86(2), 217-247.

Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1986, May). The social context of effective schools. American Journal of Education, 94(3), 328-355.

Halpin, A. W. (1957). A paradigm for research on administrative behavior. In R. F. Campbell & R. T. Greg (Eds.). Administrative behavior in education (pp. 155-199). New York: Harper and Row.

Halpin, A. W. (1960). Ways of knowing. In R. F. Campbell & J. M. Lipham (Eds.), Administrative theory as a guide to action (pp. 3-20). Chicago: University of Chicago, Midwest Administration Center.

Hannaway, J., & Crowson, R. (Eds.). (1989). The politics of reforming school administration. New York: Falmer.

Hanson, E. M. (1991). School-based management and educational reform: Cases in the USA and Spain. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 336 832).

Hardin, H. (1989). The privatization putsch. Halifax, Nova Scotia: The Institute for Research on Public Policy.

Hargreaves, D. H. (1994). The new professionalism: The synthesis of professional and institutional development. Teaching & Teacher Education, 10(4), 423-438.

Harlow, J. G. (1962). Purpose-defining: The central function of the school administrator. In J. A. Culbertson & S. P. Hencley (Eds.), Preparing administrators: New perspectives (pp. 61-71). Columbus, OH: University Council for Educational Administration.

Hart, A. W. (1993). A design studio for reflective practice. In P. Hallinger, K. Leithwood, & J. Murphy (Eds.), Cognitive perspectives on educational leadership (pp. 218-230). New York: Teachers College Press.

Hart, A. W., & Bredeson, P. V. (1996). The principalship: A theory of professional learning and practice. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hartzell, G. N., Williams, R. C., & Nelson, K. T. (1995). New voices in the field: The work lives of first-year assistant principals. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Hawley, W. D. (1988). Universities and the improvement of school management. In D. E. Griffiths, R. T. Stout, & P. B. Forsyth (Eds.), Leaders for America's schools: The report and papers of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (pp. 82-88). Berkeley: McCutchan.

Hawley, W. D. (1995, Summer). The false premises and false promises of the movement to privatize public education. Teachers College Record, 96(4), 735-742.

Herbst, J. (1996). The once and future school: Three hundred and fifty years of American secondary education. New York: Routledge.

Hill, P. T. (1994). Public schools by contract: An alternative to privatization. In S. Hakim, P. Seidenstat, & G. W. Bowman (Eds.), Privatizing education and educational choice: Concepts, plans, and experiences. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Hills, J. (1975, Autumn). The preparation of administrators: Some observations from the "firing line." Educational Administration Quarterly, 11(3), 1-20.

Himmelstein, J. L. (1983). The New Right. In R. C. Liebman and R. Wuthrow (Eds.), The New Christian Right: Mobilization and legitimation (pp. 13-30). New York: Aldine.

Hirsch, W. Z. (1991). Privatizing government services: An economic analysis of contracting out by local governments. Los Angeles: University of California, Institute of Industrial Relations.

Hood, C. (1994). Explaining economic policy reversals. Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Hoy, W. K. (1996, August). Science and theory in the practice of educational administration: A pragmatic perspective. Educational Administration Quarterly, 32(3), 366-378.

Immegart, G. L. (1977). The study of educational administration, 1954-1974. In L. L. Cunningham, W. G. Hack, R. O. Nystrand (Eds.), Educational administration: The developing decades (pp. 298-328). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Immegart, G. L. (1990). What is truly missing in advanced preparation in educational administration? Journal of Educational Administration, 28(3), 5-13.

Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium. (1996). Standards for school leaders. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.

Iwanicki, E. F. (in press). ISLLC standards and assessment in the context of school leadership reform. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education.

Jacobson, S. L. (1990). Reflections on the third wave of reform: Rethinking administrator preparation. In S. L. Jacobson & J. A. Conway (Eds.), Educational leadership in an age of reform (pp. 30-44). New York: Longman.

Jencks, C. (1966, Winter). Is the public school obsolete? The Public Interest, 2, 18-27.

Johnson, S. M. (1996). Leading to change: The challenge of the new superintendency. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Katz, M. B. (1971, Summer). From voluntarism to bureaucracy in American education. Sociology of Education, 44(3), 297-332.

Kerchner, C. T. (1993). The strategy of teaching strategy. In P. Hallinger, K. Leithwood, & J. Murphy (Eds.), Cognitive perspectives on educational leadership (pp. 5-20). New York: Teachers College Press.

Kliebard, H. M. (1995). The struggle for the American curriculum 1893-1958 (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Krug, E. A. (1964). The shaping of the American high school. New York: Harper and Row.

Lakomski, G. (1998, Fall). Training administrators in the wild: A naturalistic perspective. UCEA Review, 34(3), 1, 5, 10-11.

Lawton, S. B. (1991, September). Why restructure? Revision of paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Leithwood, K., Chapman, J., Corson, D., Hallinger, P., & Hart, A. (Eds.). (1996). International handbook of educational leadership and administration. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer.

Leithwood, K., Leonard, L., & Sharatt, L. (1998, April). Conditions fostering organizational learning in schools. Educational Administration Quarterly, 34(2), 243-276.

Leithwood, K. A., & Stager, M. (1989, May). Expertise in principals' problem solving. Educational Administration Quarterly, 25(2), 126-151.

Lewis, D. A. (1993). Deinstitutionalization and school decentralization: Making the same mistake twice. In J. Hannaway & M. Carnoy (Eds.), Decentralization and school improvement (pp. 84-101). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Liebman, R. C. (1983a). Introduction. In R. C. Liebman and R. Wuthnow (Eds.), The New Christian Right: Mobilization and legitimation (pp. 1-9). New York: Aldine.

Liebman, R. C. (1983b). The making of the New Christian Right. In R. C. Liebman and R. Wuthnow (Eds.), The New Christian Right: Mobilization and legitimation (pp. 227-238). New York: Aldine.

Liebman, R. C., & Wuthnow, R. (Eds.). (1983). The New Christian Right: Mobilization and legitimation. New York: Aldine.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Lotto, L. S. (1983, Winter). Believing is seeing. Organizational Theory Dialogue, 31(6), 6-26.

Louis, K. S., & Kruse, S. D. (1996). Professionalism and community: Perspectives on reforming urban schools. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Louis, K. S., & Miles, M. B. (1990). Improving the urban high school: What works and why. New York: Teachers College Press.

Louis, K. S., & Murphy, J. (1994). The evolving role of the principal: Some concluding thoughts. In J. Murphy & K. S. Louis (Eds.), Reshaping the principalship: Insights from transformational reform efforts (pp. 265-281). Newbury park, CA: Corwin Press.

Mann, D. (1975, May). What peculiarities in educational administration make it difficult to profess: An essay. The Journal of Educational Administration, 13(1), 139-147.

Marshall, C. (1992). The assistant principal: Leadership choices and challenges. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Marshall, R., & Tucker, M. (1992). Thinking for a living: Work, skills, and the future of the American economy. New York: Basic Books.

Martin, B. (1993). In the public interest? Privatization and public sector reform. London: Zed Books.

Mayberry, M. (1991, April). Conflict and social determinism: The reprivatization of education. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

McCarthy, M. M. (1999). The evolution of educational leadership preparation programs. In J. Murphy & K. S. Louis (Eds.), Handbook of research on educational administration (2nd ed., pp. 119-139). San Fransicso: Jossey-Bass.

McCarthy, M. M., Cambron-McCabe, N. H., & Thomas, S. B. (1998). Public school law: Teachers' and students' rights. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

McCarthy, M. M., & Kuh, G. D. (1997). Continuity and change: The educational leadership professoriate. Columbia, MO: The University Council for Educational Administration.

McCarthy, M. M., Kuh, G. D., Newell, L. J., & Iacona, C. M. (1988). Under scrutiny: The educational administration professoriate. Tempe, AZ: University Council for Educational Administration.

McKerrow, K. (1998). Administrative internships: Quality or quantity? Journal of School Leadership, 8(2), 171-186.

McNeil, L. M. (1988, January). Contradictions of control, part 1: Administrators and teachers. Phi Delta Kappan, 69(5), 333-339.

Miklos, E. (1988). Administrator selection, career patterns, succession, and socialization. In N. J. Boyan (Ed.), Handbook of research on educational administration (pp. 53-76). New York: Longman.

Milstein, M. M. (1990). Rethinking the clinical aspects of preparation programs: From theory to practice. In S. L. Jacobson & J. A. Conway (Eds.), Educational leadership in an age of reform (pp. 119-130). New York: Longman.

Milstein, M. (1996, October). Clinical aspects of educational administration preparation programs. Paper prepared for a workshop of the Mississippi professors of educational administration, Jackson.

Milstein, M., & Associates. (1993). Changing the way we prepare educational leaders: The Danforth experience. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Mitchell, B., & Cunningham, L. L. (Eds.). (1990). Educational leadership and changing contexts of families, communities, and schools. (Eighty-ninth National Society for the Study of Education Yearbook, Part II). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Monk, D. K., & Plecki, M. L. (1999). Generating and managing resources for school improvement. In J. Murphy & K. S. Louis (Eds.), Handbook of research on educational administration (2nd ed.) (pp. 491-510). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mulkeen, T. A. (1990). Reinventing school leadership. Working memo prepared for the Reinventing School Leadership Conference. Cambridge, MA: The National Center for Educational Leadership.

Mulkeen, T. A., Cambron-McCabe, N. H., & Anderson, B. J. (Eds.) (1994). Democratic leadership: The changing context of administrative preparation. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Mulkeen, T. A., & Cooper, B. S. (1989, March). Implications of preparing school administrators for knowledge-work organizations. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Mulkeen, T. A., & Tetenbaum, T. J. (1990). Teaching and learning in knowledge organizations: Implications for the preparation of school administrators. Journal of Educational Administration, 28(3), 14-22.

Murnane, R. J., & Levy, F. (1996). Teaching the new basic skills: Principles for educating children to thrive in a changing economy. New York: The Free Press.

Murphy, J. (1990a). The educational reform movement of the 1980s: A comprehensive analysis. In J. Murphy (Ed.), The educational reform movement of the 1980s: Perspectives and cases (pp. 3-55). Berkeley: McCutchan.

Murphy, J. (1990b, Fall). Restructuring the technical core of preparation programs in educational administration. UCEA Review, 31(3), 4-5, 10-13.

Murphy, J. (1990c). The reform of school administration: Pressures and calls for change. In J. Murphy (Ed.). The educational reform movement of the 1980s: Perspectives and cases (pp. 277-303). Berkeley: McCutchan.

Murphy, J. (1990d). Principal instructional leadership. In L. S. Lotto & P. W. Thurston (Eds.), Advances in educational administration: Changing perspectives on the school. (Vol. 1 Part B, pp. 163-200). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Murphy, J. (1991, Spring). The effects of the educational reform movement on departments of educational leadership. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 13(1), 49-65.

Murphy, J. (1992). The landscape of leadership preparation: Reframing the education of school administrators. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Murphy, J. (1993a). Ferment in school administration: Rounds 1-3. In J. Murphy (Ed.), Preparing tomorrow's school leaders: Alternative designs (pp. 1-17). University Park, PA: University Council for Educational Administration.

Murphy, J. (Ed.). (1993b). Preparing tomorrow's school leaders: Alternative designs. University Park, PA: University Council for Educational Administration.

Murphy, J. (1994). Transformational change and the evolving role of the principalship: Early empirical evidence. In J. Murphy & K. S. Louis (Eds.), Reshaping the principalship: Insights from transformational reform efforts (pp. 20-53). Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Murphy, J. (1996). The privatization of schooling: Problems and possibilities. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Murphy, J. (1999a). New consumerism: Evolving market dynamics in the institutional dimension of schooling. In J. Murphy & K. S. Louis (Eds.), Handbook of research on educational administration (2nd ed., pp. 405-419). San Fransicso: Jossey-Bass.

Murphy, J. (1999b). A decade of change: An overview. In J. Murphy & P. Forsyth (Eds.) Educational administration: A decade of reform (pp. -). Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Murphy, J. (in press). Educational governance: The shifting playing field. Teachers College Record.

Murphy, J., & Beck, L. G. (1995). School-based management as school reform: Taking stock. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Murphy, J., & Forsyth, P. (Eds.). (1999). Educational administration: A decade of reform. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Murphy, J., & Hallinger, P. (1989, March-April). Equity as access to learning: Curricular and instructional treatment differences. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 21(2), 129-149.

Murphy, J., Hallinger, P., Lotto, L. S., & Miller, S. K. (1987, December). Barriers to implementing the instructional leadership role. Canadian Administrator, 27(3), 1-9.

Murphy, J. Hallinger, P., Weil, M., & Mitman, A. (1983, Fall), (1984, September). Instructional leadership: A conceptual framework. Planning and Changing, 14(3), 137-149.

Murphy, J., & Louis, K. S. (Eds.). (1994). Reshaping the principalship: Insights from transformational reform efforts. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Murphy, J., & Louis, K. S. (Eds.). (1999). Handbook of research on educational administration (2nd ed). San Fransicso: Jossey-Bass.

Muth, R. (1989, October). Reconceptualizing training for educational administrators and leaders: Focus on inquiry (Notes on Reform, No. 2). Charlottesville, VA: National Policy Board for Educational Administration.

National Commission for the Principalship. (1990). Principals for our changing schools: Preparation and certification. Fairfax, VA: Author.

National Commission for the Principalship. (1993). Principals for our changing schools: The knowledge and skill base. Fairfax, VA: Author.

National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration. (1987). Leaders for America's schools. Tempe, AZ: University Council for Educational Administration.

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (1996). What matters most: Teaching for America's future (summary report). New York: Author.

National Policy Board for Educational Administration. (1989). Improving the preparation of school administrators: The reform agenda. Charlottesville, VA: Author.

Newlon, J. H. (1934). Educational administration as social policy. New York: Scribner.

Newmann, F. M., & Wehlage, G. G. (1995). Successful school restructuring. Madison: University of Wisconsin-Madison, Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools.

Norton, M. S., & Levan, F. D. (1987, Winter). Doctoral studies of students in educational administration programs in UCEA member institutions. Educational Considerations, 14(1), 21-24.

Osin, L., & Lesgold, A. (1996, Winter). A proposal for the reengineering of the educational system. Review of Educational Research, 66(4), 621-656.

Osterman, K. F., & Kottkamp, R. B. (1993). Reflective practice for educators: Improving schooling through professional development. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Pepper, J. B. (1988). Clinical education for school superintendents and principals: The missing link. In D. E. Griffiths, R. T. Stout, & P. R. Forsyth (Eds.), Leaders for America's Schools: The report and papers of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (pp. 360-366). Berkeley: McCutchan.

Peterson, K. D., & Finn, C. E. (1985, Spring). Principals, superintendents and the administrator's art. The Public Interest, 79, 42-62.

Popper, S. H. (1982, Winter). An advocate's case for the humanities in preparation programs for school administration. The Journal of Educational Administration, 20(1), 12-22.

Pounder, D. G., Ogawa, R. T., & Adams, E. A. (1995, November). Learning as an organization-wide phenomena: Its impact on school performance. Educational Administration Quarterly, 31(4), 564-588.

Powell, A. G., Farrar, E., & Cohen, D. K. (1985). The shopping mall high school: Winners and losers in the educational marketplace. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Prawat, R. S., & Peterson, P. L. (1999). Social constructivist views of learning. In J. Murphy & K. S. Louis (Eds.), Handbook of research on educational administration (2nd ed., pp. 203-226). San Fransicso: Jossey-Bass.

President's Commission on Privatization. (1988). Privatization: Toward more effective government. Washington, DC: U.S. Government.

Prestine, N. A. (1994). Ninety degrees from everywhere: New understandings of the principal's role in a restructuring Essential School. In J. Murphy & K. S. Louis

(Eds.), Reshaping the principalship: Insights from transformational reform efforts (pp. 123-153). Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Prestine, N. A. (1995). Crisscrossing the landscape: Another turn at cognition and educational administration. Educational Administration Quarterly, 31(1), 134-142.

Putnam, R. D. (1995). Bowling alone: America's declining social capital. Journal of Democracy, 6(1), 65-77.

Reese, W. J. (1995). The origins of the American high school. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Reyes, P., Wagstaff, L. H., & Fusarelli, L. D. (1999). Delta forces: The changing fabric of American society and education. In J. Murphy & K. S. Louis (Eds.), Handbook of research on educational administration (2nd ed., pp. 183-201). San Fransicso: Jossey-Bass.

Ross, R. L. (1988). Government and the private sector: Who should do what? New York: Crane Russak.

Rowan, B. (1995, February). Research on learning and teaching in K-12 school: Implications for the field of educational administration. Educational Administration Quarterly, 31(1), 115-133.

Rungeling, B., & Glover, R. W. (1991, January). Educational restructuring--the process for change? Urban Education, 25(4), 415-427.

Sackney, L. E., & Dibski, D. J. (1992, August). School-based management: A critical perspective. Paper presented at the Seventh Regional Conference of the Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration, Hong Kong.

Sarason, S. B. (1994). Parental involvement and the political principle: Why the existing governance structure of schools should be abolished. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Scheurich, J. J. (1995). The knowledge base in educational administration: Postpositivist reflections. In R. Donmoyer, M. Imber, & J. J. Scheurich (Eds.), The knowledge based in educational administration: Multiple perspectives (pp. 17-31). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1987). The principalship: A reflective practice perspective. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1989). Mystics, neats, and scruffies: Informing professional practice in educational administration. The Journal of Educational Administration, 27(2), 7-21.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1991, March). The dark side of professionalism in educational administration. Phi Delta Kappan, 72(7), 521-526.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1993). Organizations or communities: Changing the metaphor changes the theory. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, Georgia.

Sergiovanni, T. J., & Starratt, R. J. (1988). Supervision: Human perspectives (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Shakeshaft, C. (1988). Women in educational administration: Implications for training. In D. E. Griffiths, R. T. Stout, & P. R. Forsyth (Eds.), Leaders for America's schools: The report and papers of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (pp. 403-416). Berkeley: McCutchan.

Short, P. M., & Rinehart, J. S. (1993). Reflection as a means of developing expertise. Educational Administration Quarterly, 29(4), 501-521.

Silver, P. F. (1978a). Some areas of concern in administrator preparation. In P. F. Silver & D. W. Spuck (Eds.), Preparatory programs for educational administrators in the United States (pp. 202-215). Columbus, OH: University council for Educational Administration.

Silver, P. F. (1978b). Trends in program development. In P. F. Silver & D. W. Spuck (Eds.), Preparatory programs for educational administrators in the United States (pp. 178-201). Columbus, OH: University Council for Educational Administration.

Silver, P. F. (1982). Administrator preparation. In H. E. Mitzel (Ed.), Encyclopedia of educational research (5th ed., Vol. 1, pp. 49-59). New York: Free Press.

Silver, P. F. (1986, Summer). Case records: A reflective practice approach to administrator development. Theory Into Practice, 25(3), 161-167.

Silver, P. F. (1987). The Center for Advancing Principal Excellence (APEX): An approach to professionalizing educational administration. In. J. Murphy & P. Hallinger (Eds.), Approaches to administrative training in education (pp. 67-82). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Sirotnik, K. A., & Durden, P. C. (1996). The validity of administrator performance assessment systems: The ADI as a case-in-point. Educational Administration Quarterly, 31(3), 449-472.

Sizer, T. R. (1984). Horace's compromise: The dilemma of the American high school. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Slater, R. O. (1995, August). The sociology of leadership and educational administration. Educational Administration Quarterly, 31(3), 449-472.

Sparks, D., & Hirsh, D. (1997). A new vision for staff development. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Starr, P. (1991). The case for skepticism. In W. T. Gormley (Ed.), Privatization and its alternatives (pp. 25-36). Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.

Starratt, J. (1991, May). Building on ethical school: A theory for practice in educational leadership. Educational Administration Quarterly, 27(2), 185-202.

Stringfield, S., Ross, S., & Smith, L. (Eds.). (1996). Bold plans for school restructuring: The New American Schools designs. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Sykes, G. (1999). The "new professionalism" in education: An appraisal. In J. Murphy & K. S. Louis (Eds.), Handbook of research on educational administration (2nd ed., pp. 227-249). San Fransicso: Jossey-Bass.

Sykes, G., & Elmore, R. F. (1989). Making schools more manageable: Policy and administration for tomorrow's schools. In J. Hannaway & R. L. Crowson (Eds.), The politics of reforming school administrations (pp. 77-94). New York: Falmer Press.

Thayer, F. C. (1987). Privatization: Carnage, chaos, and corruption. In B. J. Carroll, R. W. Conant, & T. A. Easton (Eds.), Private means, public ends: Private business in social service delivery (pp. 146-170). New York: Praeger.

Thomson, S. D. (1999). Causing change: The National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA). In J. Murphy & P. Forsyth (Eds.), Educational administration: A decade of reform (pp. -). Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Tomlinson, J. (1986). Public education, public good. Oxford Review of Education, 12(3), 211-222.

Tyack, D. B., & Cummings, R. (1977). Leadership in American public schools before 1954: Historical configurations and conjectures. In L. L. Cunningham, W. G. Hack, & R. O. Nystrand (Eds.), Educational administration: The developing decades (pp. 46-66). Berkeley: McCutchan.

Tyack, D. B. (1993). School governance in the United States: Historical puzzles and anomalies. In J. Hannaway & M. Carnoy (Eds.), Decentralization and school improvement (pp. 1-32). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Van Meter, E. (1999). The evaluation of curriculum in preparation programs. In J. Murphy & P. Forsyth (Eds.), Educational administration: A decade of reform (pp. -). Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Wallace, R. C. (1996). From vision to practice: The art of educational leadership. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Weick, K. E. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. Administrative Science Quarterly, 21, 1-19.

Weick, K. E., & McDaniel, R. R. (1989). How professional organizations work: Implications for school organization and management. In T. J. Sergiovanni & J. H. Moore (Eds.), Schooling for tomorrow: Directing reforms to issues that count (pp. 330-355). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Whitty, G. (1984, April). The privatization of education. Educational Leadership, 41(7), 51-54.

Willower, D. J. (1983, Summer). Evolutions in the professorship: Past philosophy, future. Educational Administration Quarterly, 19(3), 179-200.

Willower, D. J. (1988). Synthesis and projection. In N. J. Boyan (Ed.), Handbook of research on educational administration (pp. 729-747). New York: Longman.

Willower, D. J. (1996, August). Inquiry in educational administration and the spirit of the times. Educational Administration Quarterly, 32(3), 344-365.

Willower, D. J. (1998, September). Fighting the fog: A criticism of postmodernism. Journal of School Leadership, 8(5), 448-463.

Willower, D. J., & Forsyth, P. B. (1999). A brief history of scholarship on educational administration. In J. Murphy & K. S. Louis (Eds.), Handbook of research on educational administration (2nd ed., pp. 1-23). San Fransicso: Jossey-Bass.

Wise, A. E. (1989). Professional teaching: A new paradigm for the management of education. In T. J. Sergiovanni & J. H. Moore (Eds.), Schooling for tomorrow: Directing reforms to issues that count (pp. 301-310). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Young, I. P., Place, A. W., Rinehart, J. S., Jury, J. C., & Baits, D. F. (1997). Teacher recruitment: A test of the similarity-attraction hypothesis for race and sex. Educational Administration Quarterly, 33(1), 86-106.